

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Pre-U Certificate

www.XtremePapers.com

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 series

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 should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2013 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9786	02

Essay: Generic Marking Descriptors for Paper 2

- The full range of marks will be used as a matter of course.
- Examiners will look for the 'best fit', not a 'perfect fit' in applying the Levels. Good performance on one AO may compensate for shortcomings on others.
- HOWEVER, essays not deploying material over the full range of the two AOs will be most unlikely to attain a mark in Level 5.
- Examiners will provisionally award the middle mark in the Level and then moderate up/down according to individual qualities within the answer.
- Question-specific mark schemes will be neither exhaustive nor prescriptive. Appropriate, substantiated responses will always be rewarded. Answers may develop a novel and possibly intuitive response to a question. This is to be credited if arguments are fully substantiated.
- The ratio of marks AO1 to AO2 is 2:1

Level/marks	Descriptors
5 25 – 21 marks	<p>ANSWERS MAY NOT BE PERFECT, BUT WILL REPRESENT THE BEST THAT MAY BE EXPECTED OF AN 18-YEAR-OLD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly focussed analysis that answers the question convincingly. • Sustained argument with a strong sense of direction. Strong, substantiated conclusions. • Gives full expression to material relevant to both AOs. • Towards the bottom, may be a little prosaic or unbalanced in coverage yet the answer is still comprehensively argued. • Wide range of citation of relevant information, handled with confidence to support analysis and argument. • Excellent exploration of the wider context, if relevant.
4 20-16 marks	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW MANY FEATURES OF LEVEL 5, BUT THE QUALITY WILL BE UNEVEN ACROSS THE ANSWER.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A determined response to the question with clear analysis across most but not all of the answer. • Argument developed to a logical conclusion, but parts lack rigour. Strong conclusions adequately substantiated. • Response covers both AOs, but is especially strong on one AO so reaches this Level by virtue of the argument/analysis. • Good but limited and/or uneven range of relevant information used to support analysis and argument. Description is avoided. • Good analysis of the wider context, if relevant.
3 15 – 11 marks	<p>THE ARGUMENT WILL BE REASONABLY COMPETENT, BUT LEVEL 3 ANSWERS WILL BE LIMITED AND/OR UNBALANCED.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engages well with the question although analysis is patchy and, at the lower end, of limited quality. • Tries to argue and draw conclusions, but this breaks down in significant sections of description. • The requirements of both AOs are addressed, but without any real display of flair or thinking. • Good but limited and/or uneven range of relevant information used to describe rather than support analysis and argument. • Fair display of knowledge to describe the wider context, if relevant.
2 10 – 5 marks	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW A GENERAL MISMATCH BETWEEN QUESTION & ANSWER.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some engagement with the question, but limited understanding of the issues. Analysis and conclusions are sketchy at best. • Limited argument within an essentially descriptive response. Conclusions are limited/thin. • Factually limited and/or uneven. Some irrelevance. • Perhaps stronger on AO1 than AO2 (which might be addressed superficially or ignored altogether). • Patchy display of knowledge to describe the wider context, if relevant.
1 4 – 0 marks	<p>ANSWERS IN LEVEL 1 WILL SHOW A CLEAR SENSE OF THE CANDIDATE HAVING LOST CONTROL OF HIS/HER MATERIAL.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no engagement with the question. Little or no analysis offered. • Little or no argument. Any conclusions are very weak. Assertions are unsupported and/or of limited relevance. • Little or no display of relevant information. • Little or no attempt to address AO2. • Little or no reference to the wider context, if relevant.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9786	02

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.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9786	02

Augustus and the creation of the principate

- 1 (a) 'Augustus used religion entirely for his own purposes.' To what extent do you agree with this view?

Specific

While all the set sources could be referred to for one point or another, arguably the two key texts are Horace's *Carmen Saeculare* and *Res Gestae* – because they are in their different ways such good evidence for what Augustus was trying to do with religion. Essays should attempt to cover the variety of ways in which Augustus used religion and how effectively he did so: holding posts himself (e.g. Pontifex Maximus), the temple rebuilding programme, the iconography of the Ara Pacis; the Julian laws. It would be interesting if essays included some discussion of the character of Aeneas in *The Aeneid*, where his chief characteristic seems to be *pietas*. Essays could also include some discussion of the way Augustus' use of religion to support and characterise his regime must be seen as a matter of public relations, given his own behaviour (and the behaviour of those in the imperial court, including members of his own family). There is relevant material in both Suetonius and Tacitus.

- (b) How well do you think Augustus made arrangements for a secure succession throughout his reign?

Specific

Clearly, accurate information about the various anointed successors is required, from Marcellus, through Agrippa, Gaius and Lucius to Tiberius. Also, it would be a good idea to consider the various ways in which the successor was indicated (shared consulship, legal powers granted, marriage). The various branches of the imperial family need to be accurately understood. In particular, the role of Livia needs to be explored carefully, as does the attitude of Tiberius to Gaius and Lucius and his consequent retirement to Rhodes. Augustus' difficulties were mainly: as above the competing interests of various members of the ruling family; the problem of how to manage his public relations, and his relation to the senate.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9786	02

Ovid's *Metamorphoses*

- 2 (a) **'Ovid's *Metamorphoses* is essentially a poem about love. To what extent do you agree?**

Specific

The question should lead candidates to consider the nature of the stories in the *Metamorphoses* and the love interest which is shown in many of the transformations which take place. However, the inclusion of the word 'essentially' is intended to encourage candidates to consider other elements of the poem, and perhaps think about its epic nature or the meaning of the transformations – such as a response to the Roman interest in aetiologies. Likewise, candidates could consider at the basic level the nature of the poem as an epic, whilst also encouraging the more adventurous students to consider the ways in which the *Metamorphoses* can itself be seen as a *Metamorphosis*. The fact that most of the transformations have an element of erotic interest could be discussed, both in the general outline of the story, and in the particulars of Ovid's treatment. Candidates might also note the speed with which Ovid depicts the actual transformations, compared with the detail which he gives in describing the build up to the transformations.

Candidates can use any of the stories which they have studied to exemplify their points and further their argument.

- (b) **'Ovid's poem is the complete epic: it is filled with great heroes and their achievements.'** To what extent do you agree with this assessment of the *Metamorphoses*?

Specific

Candidates should argue with the proposition in the question, and consider what exactly it means. The question leaves it open to them to consider a number of different areas: the nature of the poem as an epic, the considerable time scales involved in Ovid's story-telling from the beginning of creation to the developments in Rome under Augustus, and the nature of the heroes within the poem. They should be able to question the heroism of the heroes against their understanding of what a hero is. They should look in detail at some examples from the text to exemplify their points. Candidates should consider how Ovid manages the links between stories to ensure that the narrative holds together, and how this linking develops the idea of the poem as a unified piece of work, rather than a collection of individual stories.

Candidates will not need to cover all areas, and if they wish to focus on one rather than another (e.g. time-scale rather than heroism) they should still be able to gain excellent marks.

Candidates should be able to use any of the stories which they have studied to support their arguments.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9786	02

Nero as seen through the eyes of Suetonius and Tacitus

- 3 (a) 'For Tacitus it was Nero's impact on Rome that was most important, but for Suetonius it was the emperor's character.' To what extent do you agree with this distinction between the two authors?

Specific

The core of this question is the differences between Tacitus and Suetonius as sources, and revolves around two principal but overlapping differences between them. The first is Tacitus as a historian, writing an annalistic account of Rome under the emperors, against Suetonius as a biographer, writing about the personal character and acts of the emperor. The second is Tacitus as a senator, concerned with the administration and governance of Rome and its empire and very much interested in policy and strategy, and a member of the political class that had 'lost' power under the principate, versus Suetonius as a knight, who had held positions in the imperial household, did not necessarily view the principate in itself as detrimental to Rome, and perhaps is more inclined to identify Rome with its emperor without sensing a contradiction.

Candidates should be able to address the first difference, between historian and biographer, with a degree of confidence and familiarity. They may cite the way in which Suetonius' narrative never really departs from the emperor's person, whereas Tacitus narrates affairs outside of Rome when the emperor is there, and at Rome when he is away. This should be developed by comparing narratives of the same event; e.g. Tacitus narrates the fire as an event in itself and adds rumours about Nero's involvement afterwards, while Suetonius tells nothing about the fire other than more vivid and less cautiously selected anecdotes about Nero's part in it. They may note the lack of senatorial debate or military campaigning in Suetonius, whereas these form a regular feature of Tacitus' narrative. More sophisticated candidates may note Tacitus' frequent reference to the city, almost as an entity in the narrative, as well as regular comments on the corrupting influence upon public morality and decency of Nero and his court; Suetonius offers judgement upon Nero's character, but not always, and only on a personal level. Candidates may also usefully discuss Tacitus' apparent greater selectiveness with sources, Suetonius frequently offering more outrageous stories with no greater evident reliability; such a discussion should maintain a focus on the question.

The second difference, that between Tacitus' senatorial and Suetonius' equestrian stance, may not be apparent to weaker candidates, and it should be possible to achieve a low Merit with sufficient discussion of the points above. Better candidates may, though, seek to account for the differences between the authors as well as observe them, and consider the differences in personal perspective. As well as demonstrable senatorial 'bias' in Tacitus (and discussion of his often contemptuous attitude to the plebs and populist policy may find a place here), the lack of such a stance and the more 'private' nature of Suetonius' narrative may be explained by his history as an 'insider' of the imperial household. Some candidates may feel that Suetonius' access to personal correspondence and such material places him at an advantage to Tacitus in assessing the true nature of the emperors, but this may be set against questions over his reliability on incidents of a scandalous or salacious nature. Particularly advanced candidates may observe that the 'Rome' Tacitus describes, meanwhile, may be more of a construct of his own ideology or wishful thinking, and the contemporary attitude to Rome and the emperors may be better reflected in Suetonius' more personal account.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9786	02

- (b) 'Nero was a man of the people, who understood that the Senate had little real power, and who ruled instead by popular appeal.' To what extent do you feel that this is a fair reflection on Nero's reign, based on your reading of Tacitus and Suetonius?

Specific

In answering this question candidates would ideally deal with: Nero's courting of/relationship with the plebs; his relationship with the senate; whether the people of Rome could be considered to have benefited from his rule. Candidates should also show an awareness at least of the fact that these things may have changed during the course of his reign, if not discuss how and as a response to what. Both authors show a progression of Nero's faults during his reign, and so to treat him and issues around him as fixed and unchanging is likely to limit what credit can be given to a candidate's response.

Nero's credentials as a man of the people may be supported by successful projects such as the rebuilding following the fire of AD64, for which Tacitus details measures involving considerable and genuine thought and attention, as well as by projected but unfinished schemes such as the draining of malarial marshes and building of canals (in Italy as well as at Corinth) to improve infrastructure. Set against these might be such details as the fact that some projects were uncompleted, or did not progress beyond grand ideas; and the other side of the rebuilding of Rome, with great swathes of the city being requisitioned and cleared for the *domus aurea*.

Nero's understanding that the senate had little real power may also cut both ways. It could be argued that he had a shrewd understanding of how power worked during the principate and that in many ways the senate was largely 'ceremonial'. On the other hand, this does not explain why he went often to great lengths to antagonise the senate, seemingly taking pleasure in humiliating them publicly, even, according to Suetonius, threatening to wipe the senatorial order out completely. This humiliation of the senate could be seen as a way in which he courted the plebs, rather than an end in itself, but even then it does not explain why he chose this way to curry favour with the general populace. It could also be argued that the reason the senate had little real power was because of the way he wielded power, and was therefore a situation of his own making, rather than one he observed. The Pisonian conspiracy reveals both the depth of frustration felt by the senate, by virtue of its existence, and also demonstrates how ineffectual it had become, by virtue of its shambolic failure. It may also be observed that the senate had become so used to being on the margins of the emperor's power that they proposed to replace the emperor, rather than remove the office.

Nero's taste for popular entertainment may be seen as part of his recognition that true power lay in the people's favour. This, though, would be to ignore the way the sources present it, which is as self-indulgence rather than political calculation; Nero's careful introduction of his own performances, beginning in private, then in public in cities of a more Greek nature such as Naples before Rome, perhaps indicates that he was aware this was not something that would endear him to the plebs. Nero's often lavish use of the dole alongside entertainments may be more relevant. Candidates may be aware that there was no history of popular support actively maintaining or removing an emperor; it may be argued that this was more something that helped Nero undermine the senate than the other way round, for example in his omission of the senate in expressing his hopes for the benefits of the Corinth Canal. Popular support for Nero may be portrayed by advanced candidates as a symptom of the plebs' lack of power, in that they felt that since they had no power at least they could be entertained. While Nero is a complex and contradictory character, reports of his nocturnal murders of citizens in the street and burglaries of shops suggest that he was far from genuinely interested in the lot of the common citizen.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9786	02

Roman architecture and building

- 4 (a) 'The religious buildings built by the Romans are very different from one another in terms of design, purpose and method of construction.' On the basis of the religious buildings you have studied, to what extent would you agree with this view?

Specific

The question requires a detailed treatment of an adequate range of specific religious buildings. There is a limited range of the types of buildings listed in the specification, and at the highest levels these should be described in detail and set in their appropriate contexts. These may then be compared to assess whether they are indeed 'of utterly different designs' or share common features, whether in construction methods, ground-plans, or general features. This discussion should then lead to a reasoned conclusion related to the title. The Maison Carrée [Nîmes]; the Pantheon [Rome], the Temple of Vesta [Rome], the Temple of Augustus and Livia [Vienne] are suggested examples from the specification; any other buildings with a religious purpose or context should be given appropriate credit.

Better answers will demonstrate 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!) The most obvious differences in **design** might be seen between 'traditional' temples such as the Maison Carreé and the much more 'radical' Pantheon, for example. **Purpose** might be explored using obvious ideas such as cult or worship – other purposes include propaganda for individuals and the inculcation of loyalty to Rome, especially in the provinces. Weaker answers may select a limited range of examples (or unsuitable ones), perhaps describing buildings with little discussion or argument developed, and in less detail; there may be less engagement with issues raised by 'common design or purpose' and unsupported assertions, or a one-sided approach which supports or criticizes the proposition without any real evaluative discussion.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9786	02

- (b) **‘Practical public buildings such as baths and aqueducts seem to have been designed by the Romans to be far more impressive than temples and religious monuments.’ How far do you agree with this statement?**

Specific

The question permits discussion of a wide range of buildings, both public ones such as aqueducts and baths, and religious buildings. These will need to be chosen quite carefully in order for enough time to be left for a discussion about their social, political and religious contexts – illustrating the value placed on them by the Romans. Examples may be those listed in the specification, or others – credit all good detail but the answer needs to go beyond the merely narrative and explore the issues which lay behind the construction of these buildings. These may be straightforward – religious motives being obvious for temples, and the provision of public amenities for e.g. the baths of Diocletian, or the Pont du Gard. Behind this lie issues such as securing the loyalty of a population (particularly at Rome), establishing the good reputation of an emperor, or civic pride.

There also needs to be an appropriate balance in the selection of material, so that ‘more important’ is clearly addressed. In this regard, the answer is open – candidates may consider the religious or propaganda imperative most important, but may see greater focus (or expenditure) on either side – for example, the marbles used in the finest examples of temple interiors (e.g. par excellence the Pantheon – though much of the evidence for earlier temples at Rome such as that of Mars Ultor or the Divine Julius is lost, and these may have rivalled it) compared with the sheer scale of aqueduct systems or public baths of Caracalla and Diocletian. Credit discussion of sculpture and statuary (Trajan’s column, triumphal arches) where found (though it is not part of the specification it can be used as relevant supporting material).

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

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9786	02

Cicero and the fall of the republic

- 5 (a) 'Though Cicero might claim on occasion to be a *popularis*, his political stance and his letters show clearly that he was an unequivocal *optimatus*.' Murrell, *Cicero and the Roman Republic*, 2008

To what extent do you agree with Murrell's assessment of Cicero's political career?

Specific

There should be plenty of readily available material for candidates to draw on to answer this question. Candidates are encouraged by the help points to define what constituted *optimatus* and *popularis* which should provide good grounds for identifying Cicero's political stance.

The careers of Pompey and Caesar (who Murrell regards as the two great *populares* of Cicero's time) may also provide fertile ground for comparing Cicero to them, his interactions with them and the methods they adopted.

Cicero's speech on the *Agrarian law* in which he calls himself a *popularis* but then argues that, while the proposed law may be a 'quick fix', it would damage the state in the long run and thus supported the *optimatus/status quo* position. Other evidence might include his defence of Rabirius from the prosecutions of two *populares*, Caesar and Labienus. There is plenty more evidence readily available (in the most commonly used books on Cicero and the Republic) taken from speeches and letters.

It is possible some candidates may argue that Cicero was neither *optimatus* nor *popularis* but a man ploughing his own furrow for the good of Rome (*concordia ordinum*) and building up a group of allies (*boni*) who would be more than temporary and so was pursuing some high ideal. On the other hand, candidates may wish to regard him as little more than a self-centred political trimmer!

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9786	02

- (b) 'The enduring hostility between Cicero and Clodius had as much to do with personal interests as with the good of the state.' How far do you agree with this assessment of their relationship?

Specific

This should provide a fertile area for candidates with a reasonable knowledge of the period.

The *bona dea* scandal is well chronicled in Cicero's letters to Atticus. Although Clodius was expected to be found guilty, he was acquitted (his counsel was Hortensius). There was plenty of other fallout (Caesar's wife).

Clodius as Tribune in 58 BC was instrumental in bringing about Cicero's exile and also carrying out a number of other 'reforms' which clearly grated on Cicero's political stance and beliefs. The reasons for exile could be seen as political and a just reforming of the law, on the other hand, it could be seen as the result of Cicero's reluctance to fall in with Caesar, Pompey and the first triumvirate. It might also be seen as a personal attack.

As a result of his exile, Cicero's house was ransacked, as were his other properties, and a temple to 'Liberty' erected on the spot in Rome. This led Cicero, on his return, to demand return of the land and reparations for the damage done from Clodius. There is no doubt that exile also took its toll on Cicero. Some modern commentators suggest he may even have had a nervous breakdown.

Personal antagonism plays a strong part, whatever his own motivation, in his defence of Caelius, which is a savage indictment of the behaviour and the morals of both 'Publius' and 'lady ox-eyes' Clodia. More ill-judged, though down to obligation and expediency, may have been his defence of Milo.

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9786	02

Urban archaeology of the Roman Near East

- 6 (a) To what extent can buildings be used as evidence for the role of cities in the economy and society of the Roman Near East?**

Specific

The question tests the candidate's ability to interpret the function of buildings within Roman cities and use these in combinations to produce arguments for the role of urban centres. Candidates might argue that different cities had different functions and/or that cities performed multiple functions. The archaeological evidence of the buildings of a given city must always drive the debate. Economic functions might include trade or manufacturing centres, clearing houses for agricultural produce. Social functions might include government and administration, religion and entertainment. Inscriptions are valid forms of evidence, but only when used to advance the function of the buildings of a given city.

For economics, basilicae exist at Aphrodisias. For government and administration, basilicae and bouleterion exist at Aphrodisias. There is evidence that the Odeon at Ephesus was used for meetings of the city's boule. Pergamum has an extensive palace complex.

All of the cities of the Roman east have extensive religious buildings. The most famous examples, however, are the temple to Aphrodite at Aphrodisias and the temples to Artemis and Cybele in Ephesus.

For entertainment, stadia, an Odeon and theatres exist at Aphrodisias. The Great Theatre at Ephesus is an excellent example of the building form, so too the theatre at Pergamum.

Page 13	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9786	02

(b) To what extent did the design of the cities of the Roman Near East improve the health of their populations?

Specific

Candidates might be expected to concentrate on cleanliness and the disposal of sewage. They could also look at physical fitness and all of the cities have gymnasia and the like. Better responses will reach judgments based on the archaeological evidence. Candidates might be expected to focus on the physical structures and amenities of the cities, they could also present a survey based on an evaluation of human remains with a discussion of disease and demographics.

Bath complexes are common features of eastern Roman cities, an extensive example of such a building has been found at Aphrodisias. So too Miletos where the well preserved Baths of Faustina would provide excellent evidence for debate. Ephesus has extensive examples of public sanitation with a complex sewer system, aqueducts, public toilets and bathhouses. Palmyra has a complex water system to provide for the population of this desert city. The temple of Asclepius at Pergamum with its associated spa complex and extensive supporting buildings and small finds presents the candidate with an opportunity to examine ancient medicine. Pergamum's water system is perhaps the best example of Roman hydraulic engineering of all the named sites of the unit.

Palmyra has an extensive necropolis that has been subject to detailed excavation. This would provide a candidate with a mass of demographic information to support their analysis.

Inscription evidence might be found in association with religious buildings. Also there are tombstones which refer to professional doctors.