

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS
Pre-U Certificate

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2010 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

9786 CLASSICAL HERITAGE

9786/02

Paper 2 (Foundations of History and Culture – Roman),
maximum raw mark 50

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

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

- CIE will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2010 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9786	02

Augustus and the creation of the principate

- 1 (a) Discuss how effective and long-lasting the settlements of 27 and 23 BC were in solving the constitutional problems at the time. [25]

General

Although the nature of questioning for Paper 1 and 2 essays aims to guide candidates towards certain important areas to focus on in each answer, there is no intention that the mark scheme should be prescriptive. All arguments that are relevant and credit worthy should be treated as such. Engagement with the question as set (in the exam room) will be an important factor in a successful answer although this may also lead to limitations in the answer. This is preferable to an approach that endeavours to mould pre-worked material of a not too dissimilar nature from the demands of the question.

Examiners are encouraged to constantly refresh their awareness of the question so as not to be carried away by the flow of an argument that may not be absolutely to the point. *Candidates must address the question set and reach an overall judgement, but no set answer is expected. The question can be approached in various ways and what matters is not the conclusions reached but the quality and breadth of the argument and analysis offered by an answer.*

Specific

Candidates clearly need to have some understanding of the reasons for Julius Caesar's assassination, and for the events that followed. In addition, detailed and accurate knowledge of the two settlements is necessary for the highest marks. Candidates should be able to distinguish between the immediate context in which the settlements took place and the larger political context.

One good way to start answering the question would be to look at the idea of *res publica restituta*, which is found both in inscriptional evidence and in *Res Gestae*. With hindsight this seems to be very bold: how can Augustus claim to be restoring the republic at the very moment when he is consolidating his own autocratic powers? Some discussion of the powers he adopts in the settlement of 27 BC is certainly required, as is an evaluation of how 'republican' they are. The settlement of 23 BC may be related to the problems of potential senatorial opposition of Augustus' use of his powers in the provinces.

So, it seems as though – broadly – the two settlements are designed to consolidate the new regime known as the principate, in a way that will not alienate the senate or provoke it to opposition.

The success of the settlements can be gauged from the fact that the republic never returned. However, that does not mean that successions were always easy or peaceful (some examples would be helpful). Some candidates might stress that the nature of imperial power changed and adapted over the years.

Candidates must be able to argue a case and justify any assertions that they make.

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9786	02

- (b) Discuss the similarities and differences between the poetic representations of Augustus and his presentation of himself. [25]

General

Although the nature of questioning for Paper 1 and 2 essays aims to guide candidates towards certain important areas to focus on in each answer, there is no intention that the mark scheme should be prescriptive. All arguments that are relevant and credit worthy should be treated as such. Engagement with the question as set (in the exam room) will be an important factor in a successful answer although this may also lead to limitations in the answer. This is preferable to an approach that endeavours to mould pre-worked material of a not too dissimilar nature from the demands of the question.

Examiners are encouraged to constantly refresh their awareness of the question so as not to be carried away by the flow of an argument that may not be absolutely to the point. *Candidates must address the question set and reach an overall judgement, but no set answer is expected. The question can be approached in various ways and what matters is not the conclusions reached but the quality and breadth of the argument and analysis offered by an answer.*

Specific

For high marks, candidates will be able to refer accurately to a wide range of sources, as listed in the helpful comments. However, top-level marks can be achieved *without* any consideration of the visual material. Candidates may be selective, as there is a lot of poetic and other literary material.

The answer needs to be framed by an understanding of Augustus' political and propaganda requirements; candidates also need to be able to distinguish between the various audiences for which different (self-) presentations are designed. Candidates also need to make proper distinctions between when the various presentations are created, because the way that Augustus presents himself and is presented change through his reign.

The poetic representations of Augustus come earlier in his reign and are, in their different ways, fairly complex. Discussion of Augustus in *The Aeneid* will clearly show that, when Augustus is mentioned, he is praised (as in book VIII on the shield of Aeneas). However, the complex relationships built up by Virgil between Aeneas and Augustus, and Hercules and Augustus, and the relative absence of Augustus from the poem as a whole means that the praise for Augustus is not necessarily unequivocal. Horace's presentation in the *Carmen Saeculare* is less ambiguous, but comes later in the regime, and near the end of Horace's life. Its intended audience is probably different as well.

In considering the *Res Gestae*, the tone and substance of the work should be evaluated sensitively. One would expect certain particular claims to be analysed, such as Augustus' claim to have transferred the republic back to the senate and people, or the emphasis Augustus gives to his temple rebuilding programme (the famous marble quotation).

Some may find sculptures harder to interpret, but some answers may be able to explain that, generally, sculptural representations a) have less politically significant detail than literary representations; b) speak to a wider audience, including – most importantly – non-senators. However, some may argue that portraits of Augustus tend to depict the *princeps* as weighed down with worry, as the man who has taken the burdens of power and administration on his shoulders, not for himself but for Rome. Such an image can also be found in *The Aeneid*, both when Aeneas carries his father from Troy, and in the figure of Atlas.

Candidates must be able to argue a case and justify any assertions that they make.

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9786	02

Ovid's *Metamorphoses*

- 2 (a) 'You'd never find a better or more right-minded man than Deucalion...' (*Metamorphoses* 1. 323)

To what extent have you found, from your reading of *Metamorphoses*, that there are no male characters better or more right-minded than Deucalion? [25]

General

Although the nature of questioning for Paper 1 and 2 essays aims to guide candidates towards certain important areas to focus on in each answer, there is no intention that the mark scheme should be prescriptive. All arguments that are relevant and credit worthy should be treated as such. Engagement with the question as set (in the exam room) will be an important factor in a successful answer although this may also lead to limitations in the answer. This is preferable to an approach that endeavours to mould pre-worked material of a not too dissimilar nature from the demands of the question.

Examiners are encouraged to constantly refresh their awareness of the question so as not to be carried away by the flow of an argument which may not be absolutely to the point. *Candidates must address the question set and reach an overall judgement, but no set answer is expected. The question can be approached in various ways and what matters is not the conclusions reached but the quality and breadth of the argument and analysis offered by an answer.*

Specific

This question asks the candidate to evaluate Ovid's portrayal of male characters. Candidates will have read only book 1 as a compulsory text and the quotation is taken from here. They should be familiar with Deucalion and discussion of his character could offer an introduction to the answer. Other books are not specifically prescribed so there are no set examples to be expected. However discussion of a range of myths and characters from *different* books *is* to be expected.

A partially satisfactory answer might be made from listing different male characters. This may cover gods and humans studied by the candidate, accompanied by brief character studies. Better answers will offer an evaluation of actions.

Within this context, some candidates might examine male characters by type; for example a hero or more contemporary figures nearer to Ovid's own time. Candidates could also consider motives such as love or greed. Interaction with other characters, both male and female, could be considered.

Candidates must be able to argue a case and justify any assertions that they make.

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9786	02

- (b) How important is the theme of love in the books of *The Metamorphoses* which you have read? [25]

General

Although the nature of questioning for Paper 1 and 2 essays aims to guide candidates towards certain important areas to focus on in each answer, there is no intention that the mark scheme should be prescriptive. All arguments that are relevant and credit worthy should be treated as such. Engagement with the question as set (in the exam room) will be an important factor in a successful answer although this may also lead to limitations in the answer. This is preferable to an approach that endeavours to mould pre-worked material of a not too dissimilar nature from the demands of the question.

Examiners are encouraged to constantly refresh their awareness of the question so as not to be carried away by the flow of an argument which may not be absolutely to the point. *Candidates must address the question set and reach an overall judgement, but no set answer is expected. The question can be approached in various ways and what matters is not the conclusions reached but the quality and breadth of the argument and analysis offered by an answer.*

Specific

This question asks the candidate to evaluate Ovid's treatment of the theme of love. Book 1 is a compulsory text so there are no set examples to be expected from the rest of the poem. However discussion of a range of myths and characters from *different* books *is* to be expected and some analysis of what the candidate understands by the theme of love.

A partially satisfactory answer might be made from listing male and female characters and the love between them. Candidates will probably consider the love between husband and wife such as Deucalion and Pyrrha. Better answers could also consider the love of a father for his son, homosexuality and even narcissism. Love may also include lust and other related emotions.

Whatever candidates decide, their answer must argue a case and justify the assertions made.

Candidates must be able to argue a case and justify any assertions that they make.

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9786	02

Nero as seen through the eyes of Suetonius and Tacitus

- 3 (a) 'Tacitus presents Nero's reign as dominated by bloodshed, Suetonius as dominated by scandal.' How reasonable is this distinction? [25]

General:

Although the nature of questioning for Paper 1 and 2 essays aims to guide candidates towards certain important areas to focus on in each answer, there is no intention that the mark scheme should be prescriptive. All arguments that are relevant and credit worthy should be treated as such. Engagement with the question as set (in the exam room) will be an important factor in a successful answer although this may also lead to limitations in the answer. This is preferable to an approach that endeavours to mould pre-worked material of a not too dissimilar nature from the demands of the question.

Examiners are encouraged to constantly refresh their awareness of the question so as not to be carried away by the flow of an argument which may not be absolutely to the point. Candidates must address the question set and reach an overall judgement, but no set answer is expected. The question can be approached in various ways and what matters is not the conclusions reached but the quality and breadth of the argument and analysis offered by an answer.

Specific:

This question invites the candidate to contrast two accounts of Nero's reign which are quite different in tone. It adopts a 'standard' approach: Tacitus' version is more serious in tone; Suetonius' more sensational and frivolous. Candidates may adopt, modify, or reject these assumptions about the authors in the course of their discussion of scandal and bloodshed in the two authors; but these two features must remain at the heart of their argument.

Tacitus' account of Nero's principate begins ominously with 'the first death of the new reign' and ends, incomplete as it is, with a death; deaths, whether murders, executions or forced suicides, are a frequent indication of the corruption of the regime. Yet scandalous behaviour performs a similar function, for example the party on the lake of Agrippa in Book 15, Nero's theatrical performances, and his night-time roaming through the city. Suetonius too presents both scandal and bloodshed in large measure, and the question is really one of tone: is Nero portrayed as more outrageous or dangerous? Both, clearly, but which predominates? Tacitus is more circumspect, for example refraining from attributing the great fire to Nero's agency; Suetonius also deals more explicitly with the party on the lake and particularly its ensuing 'marriage'. These may be argued as more matters of taste, perhaps taking the view that Tacitus views some incidents as beneath the dignity of history. Ultimately, though, one might expect the core of the argument to focus on Tacitus' role as a moraliser as opposed to Suetonius' rejection of the moralising tone of earlier biography, seeking instead to entertain and divert.

Good candidates may also mention positive features of Nero's reign, though this is not the opportunity for a defence of Nero. The question of senatorial bias may also arise in such a discussion. Credit should be given for mentioning positive features of Nero's reign, while bearing in mind that the question asks how the authors did portray Nero, not whether they were right to do so.

Candidates must be able to argue a case and justify any assertions that they make.

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9786	02

- (b) Is it reasonable to conclude from Tacitus and Suetonius that Nero only ever behaved well as an emperor because of the advice of others, and that his natural inclinations were vain and selfish? [25]

General:

Although the nature of questioning for Paper 1 and 2 essays aims to guide candidates towards certain important areas to focus on in each answer, there is no intention that the mark scheme should be prescriptive. All arguments that are relevant and credit worthy should be treated as such. Engagement with the question as set (in the exam room) will be an important factor in a successful answer although this may also lead to limitations in the answer. This is preferable to an approach that endeavours to mould pre-worked material of a not too dissimilar nature from the demands of the question.

Examiners are encouraged to constantly refresh their awareness of the question so as not to be carried away by the flow of an argument which may not be absolutely to the point. Candidates must address the question set and reach an overall judgement, but no set answer is expected. The question can be approached in various ways and what matters is not the conclusions reached but the quality and breadth of the argument and analysis offered by an answer.

Specific:

This question requires the candidate to assess an aspect of Nero's principate in the light of two commentators' views and reach their own judgement. The guide points strongly suggest a questioning approach to the reliability of the commentators, and this will require the candidate to put forward what they suggest was really the case, and why the commentators have portrayed events in the way that they have.

Candidates ought to be able to write in detail about the various advisers or similar that influenced Nero throughout his reign. The question presumes good ones, and Seneca and Burrus might feature strongly, both for their successes and their ultimate failure to curb Nero. But candidates ought to be well aware of other 'advisers' who had a pronounced negative effect, for example Agrippina and Tigellinus. Agrippina may be seen as a counterpoint to Seneca, both meeting their end when in conflict with Nero's personal desires. Candidates may question whether Nero's vanity and selfishness were not in fact encouraged by some of those around him for their own ends. Candidates may also write in detail about the vanity and selfishness displayed by Nero: his public performances might be standard examples, as might be his dying words in Suetonius. Some may regard these as harmless, but more serious examples may be found, overshadowing any good intentions, particularly perhaps in the rebuilding of Rome, and even the abortive canal project, both overshadowed by the building of the *domus aurea*, and there may be similar objections to other noble efforts.

Good candidates may observe that both commentators, perhaps especially Suetonius, are influenced by the ancient biographical view that a man's disposition at birth remained unchanged and manifested itself increasingly as opportunity presented itself. The pattern of a good beginning to a reign spoiled as personal impulses get the better of an emperor is found repeatedly in the *Annals*. This may equally account for bias, as may any senatorial bias or taste for sensation. At any rate, most candidates might argue for a more sophisticated understanding than that underlying the statement in the question, and only the weaker candidates are likely to fail to grasp that there were influences on both sides working on Nero.

Candidates must be able to argue a case and justify any assertions that they make.

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9786	02

Roman architecture and building

- 4 (a) 'In their monumental architecture, the Romans were more interested in projecting their own glory than in aesthetic considerations.' Is this a fair judgement on monuments built by the Romans? [25]

General

Although the nature of questioning for paper 1 and 2 essays aims to guide candidates towards certain important areas to focus on each answer, there is no intention that the mark scheme should be prescriptive. All arguments that are relevant and credit worthy should be treated as such. Engagement with the question set (in the exam room) will be an important factor in a successful answer although this may also lead to limitations in the answer. This is preferable to an approach that endeavours to mould pre-worked material of a not too dissimilar nature from the demands of the question.

Examiners are encouraged to refresh their awareness of the question so as not to be carried away by the flow of an argument which may not be absolutely to the point. *Candidates must address the question set and reach an overall judgement, but no set answer is expected. The question can be approached in various ways and what matters is not the conclusions reached but the quality and breadth of the argument and analysis offered by an answer.*

Specific

The question requires a specific focus on *monumental* architecture; any specific examples falling into this category should be discussed. The obvious choices are arches (Augustus and Claudius, now lost but existing in fragments; Titus, Constantine, and/or any examples from the provinces); Trajan's column; temples which commemorate victory such as *Mars Ultor*; the *Ara Pacis*; credit answers which regard constructions such as the Baths of Diocletian as 'monumental' since they were intended to remind the people of an individual's greatness and beneficence.

There should be detailed appreciation not only of the size and general design of these, but also of their detail (intricacies of sculpture and detail on Trajan's Column, Arch of Titus etc.) and the grace and balance achieved in this. Weaker responses may lack detail, make poor choices in their exemplars, or provide detailed discussion but then juxtapose it with assertions; stronger responses will engage with the motivation for putting up these structures (they *were* political statements, intended to be long-lasting reminders to Romans and others of military victory and personal greatness) and the artistic results the Romans attained in these monuments ('*The grandeur that was Rome*'), and reach a clear evaluation based on the discussion. That Romans *were* motivated by aesthetic considerations can be seen from the buildings themselves (which may be contrasted with structures of a purely religious nature – e.g. the Maison Carrée – or the Pantheon).

Whatever examples are chosen as support, the answer must contain a developed argument and justified conclusions based upon them.

Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9786	02

- (b) 'The greatest achievement of Roman architecture lay in its use of new building materials and techniques.' How far do you agree with this view? [25]

General

Although the nature of questioning for paper 1 and 2 essays aims to guide candidates towards certain important areas to focus on each answer, there is no intention that the mark scheme should be prescriptive. All arguments that are relevant and credit worthy should be treated as such. Engagement with the question set (in the exam room) will be an important factor in a successful answer although this may also lead to limitations in the answer. This is preferable to an approach that endeavours to mould pre-worked material of a not too dissimilar nature from the demands of the question.

Examiners are encouraged to refresh their awareness of the question so as not to be carried away by the flow of an argument which may not be absolutely to the point. *Candidates must address the question set and reach an overall judgement, but no set answer is expected. The question can be approached in various ways and what matters is not the conclusions reached but the quality and breadth of the argument and analysis offered by an answer.*

Specific

The question asks for evaluation of the types of material and ways of using them which were introduced by the Romans (or at least developed and popularized by them); this process began with the arch, vault and dome, and developed under Nero and the Flavians with the use of poured (and waterproof!) concrete, resulting in vast structures such as the Golden Palace, baths of Diocletian and Caracalla, Hadrian's Pantheon, and the massive harbour works at Ostia).

Stronger responses should discuss the introduction of these materials and techniques using appropriate technical vocabulary and with detailed accurate reference to well-chosen examples to illustrate the points made. They may move on to an evaluation of the issues raised by the question, developing supported judgements addressing whether these were the 'greatest achievement'; the scale and longevity of the Roman buildings might be discussed in support of the proposition, but credit arguments which find ways of opposing it – stressing the artistic merits of Roman buildings (frequently omitted in discussion of them), the attempts at continuity with earlier (Greek) patterns, the aims of achieving symmetry and elegance – arguably made more successful because of their use of the new materials and techniques. At the highest levels of response, there will be a thorough engagement with the issues raised in the question and an appreciation (which may be personal and not shared by the examiner – but credit it if it is supported and argued) of them. Weaker responses may select a narrower range of examples (or unsuitable ones), perhaps describing techniques without any illustration, and in less detail; there may be less engagement with issues raised by 'real achievement' and unsupported assertions, or a one-sided approach which supports or criticizes the proposition without any real evaluative discussion.

Page 10	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9786	02

Cicero and the fall of the republic

- 5 (a) To what extent were politics in Cicero's day more a matter of personal friendships and hostility than conviction and principle? [25]

General

Although the nature of the questioning for Paper 1 and 2 essays aims to guide candidates towards certain important areas to focus on in each answer, there is no intention that the mark scheme should be prescriptive. All arguments that are relevant and are credit worthy should be treated as such. Engagement with the question as set (in the exam room) will be an important factor in a successful answer although this may lead to limitations in the answer. This is preferable to an approach that endeavours to mould pre-worked material of a not too dissimilar nature from the demands of the question.

Examiners are encouraged to constantly refresh their awareness of the question so as not to be carried away by the flow of an argument which may not be absolutely to the point. Candidates must address the question set and reach an overall judgement, but no set answer is expected. The question can be approached in various ways and what matters is not the conclusions reached but the quality and breadth of the argument and analysis offered by an answer.

Specific

Readily available relevant material may be found in Lacey and Wilson ch 2 § 19, 20, 21; ch 3 § 31, 32; ch 4 § 34; ch 5 § 52, 53 54, 56; ch 6 § 63, 64.

There are also useful sections in Murrell *Cicero and the Roman republic*: ch 7, 8, 9; the end of ch 2 and the start of ch 3.

The syllabus requires study of 'the demands of ambitious individuals and the methods they were prepared to employ to achieve their personal aims.'

Any answer should contain an examination of the key words in the question: conviction and principle, personal friendships and enmities. Any answer should also include discussion of the first triumvirate and its breakdown, perhaps citing the importance of Julia and her marriage to Pompey and what happened following her death.

Another area for discussion could be the election of Cicero to the consulship, the possible reasons for his success in opposition to Catiline, the calling in of obligations owed to Cicero and Atticus. This may lead to an expansion of the theme exploring the need for a *novus homo* to gather support by whatever means he might. Candidates may refer to Cicero putting his rhetorical skills at the disposal of others for subsequent personal advantage. (q.v. Murrell ps. 28 and 35).

This might be contrasted with Cicero's adherence to a cause like the *concordia ordinum* and/or an individual such as Pompey or honouring obligation – Lentulus Spinther.

Cicero's relations with Julius Caesar might also be considered along with those he had with Mark Antony. There are any number of examples from the period that might be used to good effect.

It would seem most likely that candidates will argue for the second part of the question, personal relationships and enmities, perhaps acknowledging a somewhat unclear picture of where Cicero might be placed on this spectrum.

Other, perhaps more tangential, arguments might include discussion of the position of a man like Cato, regarded as a man of principle or a recalcitrant recidivist, doing little more than use his own public status to achieve personal aggrandisement... (a family thing?). Other may wish to consider, also peripherally, the exploitation of groups within society by 'popular' leaders to achieve their own ends.

Page 11	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9786	02

- (b) 'The assassination of Julius Caesar and its aftermath gave Cicero an opportunity to re-establish his political influence, an opportunity which he singularly failed to take.' How far do you agree with this assessment of Cicero's actions in this period? [25]

General

Although the nature of the questioning for Paper 1 and 2 essays aims to guide candidates towards certain important areas to focus on in each answer, there is no intention that the mark scheme should be prescriptive. All arguments that are relevant and are credit worthy should be treated as such. Engagement with the question as set (in the exam room) will be an important factor in a successful answer although this may lead to limitations in the answer. This is preferable to an approach that endeavours to mould pre-worked material of a not too dissimilar nature from the demands of the question.

Examiners are encouraged to constantly refresh their awareness of the question so as not to be carried away by the flow of an argument which may not be absolutely to the point. Candidates must address the question set and reach an overall judgement, but no set answer is expected. The question can be approached in various ways and what matters is not the conclusions reached but the quality and breadth of the argument and analysis offered by an answer.

Specific

Useful sections may be found in Lacey and Wilson ch 70, 71,72 and postscript with introductory material in chs. 68 and 69; *Cicero and the Roman republic*, the latter parts of ch 11 and ch 12.

Candidates may start by assessing the actual state of affairs within the republic at the time of Caesar's assassination and whether either side, conspirators or Octavian/Antony, had a coherent plan to take control in the vacuum. They may wish to consider whether Cicero himself or a group including Cicero were able to mediate/broker conversations between the factions, thus becoming 'power brokers' themselves.

Candidates may wish to consider what effect Cicero's longstanding loyalty to Pompey and the ideal of the 'Republic' may have had on his standing with Julius Caesar's successors. They may also wish to consider what effect Cicero's apparent indecision may have had on all parties or whether he was 'playing a game' for his own eventual advantage.

Cowell says that 'Cicero was no coward but clearly he was not of the stuff of which leaders are made.' He also mentions (p. 281) what Cicero had to say of Julius Caesar's achievements and what he had done to Rome and the Romans.

Candidates may wish to speculate on Cicero's own view of what he has to do and the likely outcome. They may wish to debate whether he was really rather more an old man floundering around in a political vacuum with an inflated opinion of his own self importance and with no backing of any substance with which to act as power broker and play a key role. That he ultimately realised that the only fitting way to end his career was by standing up to the emergent new regime, saluting the old values before submitting to the ultimate punishment at the hands of those who would treat him less tolerantly, in the new age, than others had done previously.

Page 12	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9786	02

Urban archaeology of the Roman Near East

- 6 (a) To what extent did the Roman conquest and occupation of the Near East change the nature of town planning? [25]

General

Although the nature of questioning for Paper 1 and 2 essays aims to guide candidates towards certain important areas to focus on in each answer, there is no intention that the mark scheme should be prescriptive. All arguments that are relevant and credit worthy should be treated as such. Engagement with the question as set (in the exam room) will be an important factor in a successful answer although this may also lead to limitations in the answer. This is preferable to an approach that endeavours to mould pre-worked material of a not too dissimilar nature from the demands of the question.

Examiners are encouraged to constantly refresh their awareness of the question so as not to be carried away by the flow of an argument which may not be absolutely to the point. *Candidates must address the question set and reach an overall judgement, but no set answer is expected. The question can be approached in various ways and what matters is not the conclusions reached but the quality and breadth of the argument and analysis offered by an answer.*

Specific

The question asks candidates to consider the development of town planning in the Roman Near East over time. The premise of the question can be accepted or rejected or a middle course can be taken. Better answers will link archaeological methods with the physical evidence – especially the methods used to date and phase sites. Ancient literature may be used as evidence to support the archaeology but it cannot drive the debate. Better responses will evaluate such evidence in relation to the archaeology. Inscription evidence is very valid.

A partially satisfactory answer might be highly descriptive and might find it difficult to interweave the different aspects of the response to produce a fully integrated argument.

Evidence can be drawn from an archaeological analysis of the development of one or more cities. Candidates will have to understand the development of such urban centres over time. Archaeological methods of dating and phasing sites are very appropriate and better responses may point to problems with some of this aspect of the analysis where it occurs. Post-excavation analysis is especially useful when it gives insight into the form and function of the cities and developments over time.

Better responses will be able to integrate the archaeology into a broader understanding of the motives of the Roman state in intervening in the development of cities in the Near East. The Roman Empire invested in civic architecture as a means to cement and/or reward loyalty to the state. Individual buildings and monuments were often erected to celebrate of the imperial family, etc. The introduction of new buildings reflecting the influence of Roman religious beliefs and practices is a potential source for discussion. The impact of Roman culture might be discussed, for example the conversion of the theatre at Aphrodisias to host gladiatorial contests. Candidates might the town planning of the Near Eastern cities was actually of Hellenistic origin and little changed by the arrival of Rome. Thus, there is opportunity to argue for continuity as well as change.

Candidates must be able to argue a case and justify any assertions that they make.

Page 13	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9786	02

- (b) To what extent is the social organisation of Roman cities in the Near East reflected in the urban archaeology of the region? [25]

General

Although the nature of questioning for Paper 1 and 2 essays aims to guide candidates towards certain important areas to focus on in each answer, there is no intention that the mark scheme should be prescriptive. All arguments that are relevant and credit worthy should be treated as such. Engagement with the question as set (in the exam room) will be an important factor in a successful answer although this may also lead to limitations in the answer. This is preferable to an approach that endeavours to mould pre-worked material of a not too dissimilar nature from the demands of the question.

Examiners are encouraged to constantly refresh their awareness of the question so as not to be carried away by the flow of an argument which may not be absolutely to the point. *Candidates must address the question set and reach an overall judgement, but no set answer is expected. The question can be approached in various ways and what matters is not the conclusions reached but the quality and breadth of the argument and analysis offered by an answer.*

Specific

The question invites candidates to 'model' social organisation in the Roman cities of the Near East via an archaeological survey of the extant remains – buildings and small finds. Ancient literature is a viable source for discussion in a supporting role and better candidates will discuss the relative merits of this type of source when compared with the archaeology. Inscription evidence is very welcome. Better scripts will concentrate on archaeological indicators of status, wealth and social function. Gender, as well as wealth and status, is a viable topic for discussion.

A partially satisfactory response will be unable to fully integrate archaeological evidence into the answer. It might be highly descriptive and take evidence at face value.

Evidence can be drawn from the buildings of the cities, for example administrative structures might be equated with the existence of an administrative class, and the same could be done with religious buildings. Differences in wealth and status might be established via an investigation of residential structures. An interpretation of small finds and the location of said with the city is a very fruitful avenue of investigation. Gender roles, as well as social hierarchy, are a viable part of a response. Candidates may establish patterns of development and change in social organisation over time. Better responses might link such development to factors outside the individual cities that form the case studies for the topic. An example might be the relative wealth of the urban communities of the Near East in general as a result of Roman rule.

Archaeological techniques of use are methods of post-excavation analysis, indicators of status and wealth and indicators of specialisation – gender, economic, etc.

Candidates must be able to argue a case and justify any assertions that they make.