



**General Certificate of Education
June 2012**

Classical Civilisation 1021

Roman Architecture and Town Planning

AS Unit 2E

Final

Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2012 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools and colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools and colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the schools and colleges.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

INTRODUCTION

The information provided for each question is intended to be a guide to the kind of answers anticipated and is neither exhaustive nor prescriptive. **All appropriate responses should be given credit.**

Where Greek and Latin terms appear in the Mark Scheme, they do so generally for the sake of brevity. Knowledge of such terms, other than those given in the specification, is **not** required. However, when determining the level of response for a particular answer, examiners should take into account any instances where the student uses Greek or Latin terms effectively to aid the clarity and precision of the argument.

Information in round brackets is not essential to score the mark.

DESCRIPTIONS OF LEVELS OF RESPONSE

The following procedure must be adopted in marking by levels of response:

- read the answer as a whole
- work down through the descriptors to find the one which best fits
- determine the mark from the mark range associated with that level, judging whether the answer is nearer to the level above or to the one below.

Since answers will rarely match a descriptor in all respects, examiners must allow good performance in some aspects to compensate for shortcomings in other respects. Consequently, the level is determined by the 'best fit' rather than requiring every element of the descriptor to be matched. Examiners should aim to use the full range of levels and marks, taking into account the standard that can reasonably be expected of students after one year of study on the Advanced Subsidiary course and in the time available in the examination.

Students are **not** necessarily required to respond to all the bullet points in order to reach Level 5 or Level 4, but they should cover a sufficient range of material to answer the central aspects of the question.

QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

The Quality of Written Communication will be taken into account in all questions worth 10 or more marks. This will include the student's ability

- to communicate clearly, ensuring that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate
- to select and use an appropriate form and style of writing, and
- to organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.

LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 10 MARKS

Level 4	Demonstrates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• accurate and relevant knowledge covering central aspects of the question• clear understanding of central aspects of the question• ability to put forward an argument which for the most part has an analytical and/or evaluative focus appropriate to the question and uses knowledge to support opinion• ability generally to use specialist vocabulary when appropriate.	9-10
Level 3	Demonstrates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• a range of accurate and relevant knowledge• some understanding of some aspects of the question• some evidence of analysis and/or evaluation appropriate to the question• some ability to use specialist vocabulary when appropriate.	6-8
Level 2	Demonstrates either <ul style="list-style-type: none">• a range of accurate and relevant knowledge or <ul style="list-style-type: none">• some relevant opinions with inadequate accurate knowledge to support them.	3-5
Level 1	Demonstrates either <ul style="list-style-type: none">• some patchy accurate and relevant knowledge or <ul style="list-style-type: none">• an occasional attempt to make a relevant comment with no accurate knowledge to support it.	1-2

LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 20 MARKS

Level 5	Demonstrates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• well chosen accurate and relevant knowledge covering most of the central aspects of the question• coherent understanding of the central aspects of the question• ability to sustain an argument which<ul style="list-style-type: none">has an almost wholly analytical and/or evaluative focus,responds to the precise terms of the question,effectively links comment to detail,has a clear structurereaches a reasoned conclusionis clear and coherent, using appropriate, accurate language andmakes use of specialist vocabulary when appropriate.	19-20
Level 4	Demonstrates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• generally adequate accurate and relevant knowledge covering many of the central aspects of the question• understanding of many of the central aspects of the question• ability to develop an argument which<ul style="list-style-type: none">has a generally analytical and/or evaluative focus,is broadly appropriate to the question,mainly supports comment with detail andhas a discernible structureis generally clear and coherent, using appropriate, generally accurate language andgenerally makes use of specialist vocabulary when appropriate.	14-18
Level 3	Demonstrates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• a range of accurate and relevant knowledge• some understanding of some aspects of the question• some evidence of analysis and/or evaluation appropriate to the question• some ability to structure a response using appropriate language, although with some faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar• some ability to use specialist vocabulary when appropriate.	9-13
Level 2	Demonstrates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• either a range of accurate and relevant knowledge• or some relevant opinions with inadequate accurate knowledge to support them• and sufficient clarity, although there may be more widespread faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar.	5-8
Level 1	Demonstrates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• either some patchy accurate and relevant knowledge• or an occasional attempt to make a relevant comment with no accurate knowledge to support it• and little clarity; there may be widespread faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar.	1-4

LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 30 MARKS

Level 5	<p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • well chosen accurate and relevant knowledge covering most of the central aspects of the question • coherent understanding of the central aspects of the question • ability to sustain an argument which <ul style="list-style-type: none"> has an almost wholly analytical and/or evaluative focus, responds to the precise terms of the question, effectively links comment to detail, has a clear structure reaches a reasoned conclusion is clear and coherent, using appropriate, accurate language and makes use of specialist vocabulary when appropriate. 	27-30
Level 4	<p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • generally adequate accurate and relevant knowledge covering many of the central aspects of the question • understanding of many of the central aspects of the question • ability to develop an argument which <ul style="list-style-type: none"> has a generally analytical and/or evaluative focus, is broadly appropriate to the question, mainly supports comment with detail has a discernible structure is generally clear and coherent, using appropriate, generally accurate language and generally makes use of specialist vocabulary when appropriate. 	20-26
Level 3	<p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a range of accurate and relevant knowledge • some understanding of some aspects of the question • some evidence of analysis and/or evaluation appropriate to the question • some ability to structure a response using appropriate language, although with some faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar • some ability to use specialist vocabulary when appropriate. 	13-19
Level 2	<p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • either a range of accurate and relevant knowledge • or some relevant opinions with inadequate accurate knowledge to support them • and writes with sufficient clarity, although there may be more widespread faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar. 	7-12
Level 1	<p>Demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • either some patchy accurate and relevant knowledge • or an occasional attempt to make a relevant comment with no accurate knowledge to support it • and little clarity; there may be widespread faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar. 	1-6

This page has been left intentionally blank

Mark Scheme
Unit 2E Roman Architecture and Town Planning

Section 1

Option A

01 At about what date was the Small Theatre built?

80 BC (+ or – 10 years) or early 1st C BC (1)

(1 mark)

02 Approximately how many spectators could the Small Theatre hold?

Between 1000 and 1500 (1)

(1 mark)

03 How were the spectators in the Small Theatre protected from the weather?

Permanent roof (now missing) (1)

(1 mark)

04 How were different social classes accommodated in the theatre? Give two details.

Two from: by social rank (1) / wealthiest at the front (1) / then middle classes (1) / behind them poorer male freemen (1) / women (possibly) and slaves at back (1)

(2 marks)

05 How well was the Large Theatre at Pompeii designed for the safety and comfort of spectators?

Discussion might include: stability from being built into hillside (Greek style) in 2nd C BC; originally held 3000 seated in two tiers; two side entrances then adequate for safe evacuation in any emergency; six internal sets of steps up the shallow-inclined tiers made circulation safe inside; in case of problems, wealthy citizens would be closest to exits, so first out; higher degree of danger the poorer (further up) you were; big changes in 1st C BC (romanisation) with third (upper) tier added, increasing capacity to about 5000; obvious safety implications addressed by providing upper entrance from Triangular Forum with high-level circulation possible thanks to (fairly narrow) semi-circular tunnel round to top of each internal set of steps; narrowness of tunnel and narrow steps up from Triangular Forum to circulating area could have been a safety hazard if quick evacuation needed; seating arrangements gave good view to all, even those at the back; stone seats would not have been comfortable by modern standards, but with cushions would have been fine.

Credit for discussing circulating passages at lower levels; also refreshments, latrines etc.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(10 marks)

06 To what extent do you think that the Theatre of Marcellus is better than the theatres at Pompeii and Ostia? Give reasons for your answer. Do not discuss amphitheatres.

You might include discussion of

- **choice of site**
- **materials and techniques of construction**
- **external appearance**
- **internal access and circulation**
- **how well each theatre suited its purpose.**

Factors to consider in making this judgement might include:

- **Marcellus:** completed by 13 BC as part of Augustus' rebuilding programme; tribute to his (dead) nephew Marcellus; hitherto Rome had mainly had temporary theatres; this made a statement about the new era as well as providing a suitable venue for entertainment for the masses (capacity over 20, 000); opened at almost exactly the same time as Ostia. **Pompeii (Large):** originally built for local pre-Roman population in 2nd C BC; extensively rebuilt in 'Roman' style around 80 BC as part of policy of romanisation (after failed rebellion against general Sulla); desire of Romans to impress & make their imprint on city; ditto provision of Small Theatre at same time. **Ostia:** similar background to Marcellus on smaller scale; Augustus seeking to confirm position as first Emperor by providing work (building) and public pride (in new theatre); capacity around 3,000 eventually (smaller in Augustan era)
- **Marcellus:** located in prime position between Capitol hill & Tiber; choice not influenced by topography as freestanding building (unlike earlier theatres e.g. both Pompeii). **Pompeii (Large):** Roman extension on original site chosen to fit into the hillside (standard practice before Augustus); in SW corner of (extended) city but near centre of original smaller town; quite close to main Forum so well in the thick of things; ditto Small Theatre which is adjacent and despite being created 100 years after the Large Theatre, also uses the natural hillside to support its structure. **Ostia:** as at Rome freestanding nature allowed deliberate choice of siting; away from old forum in new commercial centre to reflect the new beginning under Augustus
- **Marcellus:** great advances in technology based on elaborate substructures (providing good support); brick core reticulate-faced concrete with revolutionary barrel-vaults forming the outer corridor; these effectively acted as buttresses, providing support to the first floor & allowing wide circulation corridors there; the solidity of the whole structure also aided access to the second floor but much of this is now missing. **Pompeii (Large):** built before arch / vault technique was known so relied on natural situation for its strength; a vaulted passage helped circulation at the top but was not structurally important as with Marcellus; similar picture for Small Theatre, but even less need for artificial support as small and built into hillside; limited need for materials for both as basically earth banks. **Ostia:** built at same time as Marcellus so makes use of similar techniques on smaller scale; built entirely of tufa, but Ionic columns are early use of stucco-faced brick; because of freestanding nature, a main arched façade could give access from *decumanus maximus* at street level into a central arched corridor
- **Marcellus:** built to impress externally: freestanding so rose about 50 metres above ground; huge all round (130 metres diameter); façade v impressive (brick faced with travertine); semi-columns embellished each arcade (Doric, Ionic, then Corinthian upwards); probably statues in 1st floor arches giving human scale; **Pompeii (Large);** rather lost in hillside so no great effort to impress externally; appearance of low, quite plain structure when viewed from Triangular Forum (top of hill); no real viewpoint from rear or attempt to decorate rear wall; focus on internal appearance; similar story for Small Theatre. **Ostia:** being free-standing the theatre stood to its full height above ground level

but the structure was integrated into its surroundings to provide ease of access more than an external 'wow factor'; the main façade on the *Decumanus* consists of covered arcades with shops beneath them; attractive in a functional way; between the arches were brick pilasters with travertine bases

- **Marcellus**: series of arched entrances leading directly to lower tier of seating; from there system of ascending ramps for entry and exit to/from steeper middle tier with large circulating corridors; these leading in turn to further ramps to even steeper upper tier; all possible because of vaulted construction; **Pompeii (Large)**: double access: (original) side entrances at stage level led to six ascending stairways; after rebuilding new main high level entrance with corridor serving the original six stairways from the top; **Pompeii (Small)**: size meant two side entrances were ample; again six ascending rows of (quite shallow) steps made circulation easy; no top entrance. **Ostia**: freestanding nature allowed large central entrance at ground level and arcades for circulation round the building and direct admission to each lower area of seating; to ascend it was necessary to use the five internal staircases as at Pompeii.
- **Marcellus**: completed by 13 BC as part of Augustus' rebuilding programme; tribute to his (dead) nephew Marcellus; hitherto Rome had only had temporary theatres; this made a statement about the new era as well as providing a suitable venue for entertainment for the masses (capacity over 20,000); opened at almost exactly same time as Ostia.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(20 marks)

Option B

07 *Approximately when was the Cassette-tipo built?*

End of / late 1st C AD or start of 2nd C AD or any date 90 to 125 AD (1)

(1 mark)

08 *How did inhabitants of the Cassette-tipo obtain water?*

From the public supply (1) (allow reference to lack of direct supply).

(1 mark)

09 *Identify the areas labelled A, B and C on the plan above.*

A = Living Room (1)

B = Bedroom (1)

C = Toilet / Latrine (1)

(3 marks)

10 *How far did the construction and layout of later insulae such as the House of Diana and the Garden Houses improve upon the Cassette-tipo?*

Discussion might include: **Cassette-tipo**: early example, only 2 storeys high; no shops incorporated; no courtyard; relatively poor construction (tufa; *opus reticulatum*); little distinction between quality of accommodations on each floor; few windows; reasonable décor (black / white mosaic floors; stucco & painting on walls). **House of Diana**: 50 years or so later; still quite basic construction (rectangular block *opus latericium*); three storeys high; surrounds central courtyard; has own water supply (cistern) with latrine; shops on ground floor; access by central corridor; stairway to first floor; again has wall-paintings & mosaics decoration; still rather dark and cramped; few windows; attempt to add style by external balconies. **Garden Houses**: same time as H of Diana; two identical blocks each divided by central corridor; much larger apartments with full range of rooms (deliberately similar to

domus?); big communal garden in centre with six water fountains (water also to upper storeys); no shops (separate building nearby); Vitruvian symmetry apparent in design; clearly for more wealthy families.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(10 marks)

- 11 **To what extent did the development of housing in Pompeii and Herculaneum reflect changes in population and how far was it influenced by other factors? Give reasons for your answer and refer to specific examples of housing from both cities.**

You might include discussion of

- **social and economic changes in Pompeii and Herculaneum**
- **how housing in Pompeii changed over time**
- **the evidence provided by the Houses of the Mosaic Atrium and of the Stags in Herculaneum**
- **changes in materials and decoration of housing in both cities.**

Factors to consider in making this judgement might include:

- Pompeii larger than Herculaneum (both Greek cities before Romans took over in 3rd C BC); both opposed Rome in 1st C BC Social War but were besieged and taken by Sulla's army; his romanisation programme increased the population by settling veterans in the area and many remaining houses date from this period or later; Pompeii emerged as a wealthy trading port with a more cosmopolitan population; along with Herculaneum it became a preferred summer home for wealthy Romans; the population of Herculaneum was not just smaller but seems to have been more weighted in favour of the upper classes resulting in 'freer & more advanced styles of housing'; both cities favoured *domus* style of building
- early **Pompeian** atrium-style *domus* emerged from design used to house poor families (e.g. rich House of Sallust developed from very small & simple mid 3rd C BC dwelling); as population grew so numbers of *domus* increased filling gaps, resulting in irregular planning, shapes & sizes; also existing houses were expanded and larger houses built developing atrium style (fauces/atrium/tablinum axis ideal for salutation in wealthy family houses); also for business use shops were incorporated in frontages as tablinum often became business centre of house; in 2nd C many extended houses were developed on peristyle basis; upper storeys first appeared at same time; combination of atrium and peristyle (e.g. House of the Faun) gave increased area to combine social & business; this led to conflict between bigger houses & increasing population in 1st C, so need for higher density *domus* (e.g. House of the Menander & associated block); decline of atrium (e.g. House of Vettii) at this time reflects growing merchant classes perhaps not needing as much patron/client space; overlap between senators and equestrians; increase in value of land led to renting out to business of more of house infrastructure (e.g. House of Pansa); splitting-up of *domus* into apartments first seen; credit for details of each house used to illustrate answer to question rather than as narrative
- two late examples (1st C AD) from **Herculaneum** back up the final changes seen at Pompeii and confirm decline of atrium area noted there; e.g. House of the Mosaic Atrium: has only tablinum attached to the atrium with main living quarters at a higher level on the far side of a huge peristyle garden; clearly the house of a very wealthy family but arrangement implies lowering status of business affairs over time; House of the Stags: even richer (suggesting competitiveness in ostentatious display among rich rather than 'population change' as such) and illustrates final phase of steady growth from basic atrium building; now the original atrium is merely an entrance hall; extensions include a spacious peristyle (more a confined corridor than the usual open-air passageway) and a very large summer triclinium to the south
- credit for commenting on materials/techniques used for building *domus* (e.g. tendency to

use poor quality masonry such as *opus craticium* in later stages; problems of collapses from general increase in 1st floor accommodations within *domus*); also for citing general points about decoration (e.g. mosaics, statuary, wall-paintings etc.) if used to reflect changing values, wealth etc. during different eras.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(20 marks)

Section 2

Option C

12 **How effectively did the Romans provide water for the citizens of Pompeii and Rome? Give reasons for your answer and refer to specific examples of water supply.**

You might include discussion of

- **the original sources of water in each city**
- **development of aqueducts**
- **provision of drinking water within each city**
- **provision of water for bathing, hygiene and other amenities**
- **solutions to the problems encountered.**

Factors to consider in making this judgement might include:

- water was not a top priority in selecting the sites for either city, until pressure of population growth forced it to become one; this applied to Rome in particular which had a population of over 1 million by the 1st C AD; both cities had availability of some natural water sources (wells and rivers); Rome had the Tiber which was fine for the original village/town on the site, but could not cope with the increasing demand for drinking water, cleanliness & hygiene; Pompeii had the Sarno; both had wells which helped until demand outstripped supply
- gradual introduction of aqueducts & associated water channels, in many cases from distant water sources; **Rome**: the Aqua Appia was the first (392 BC); three more were built before 100 BC; three more (shorter ones) followed during the Augustan era; finally there were 11 (all of varying heights & rates of discharge); total length about 500 miles; credit for names of important examples. **Pompeii**: nothing in early days (made do until the romanisation of 80 BC after Sulla's conquest); an aqueduct was provided at that time from Avella; in 1st C AD Augustus added new aqueduct, Serino, which replaced (or incorporated) the original & served a wider area; this resulted in a drop in the amount of water received by Pompeii
- main aim was to provide drinking water; settling chambers & reception reservoirs were used to offload from aqueducts (in both cities) water was pumped into distribution tanks, often ornate in appearance; from here pipes led to public fountains to supply the poor; further pipes led to individual houses of the rich (often providing enough to support private bath system & latrine, garden fountains etc.); rain collected in *impluvia* supplemented this supply
- public baths system was also supplied from the distribution tanks (or in Rome direct from its own aqueduct, Aqua Marcia, in the case of Baths of Caracalla): major effect on demand for water; credit for brief description of rooms of baths (e.g. Caracalla in Rome: huge social centre; large open-air pool; hot plunge baths; massive water requirement with 1600 bathers at one time; baths fed by cisterns drawn directly from Aqua Marcia (or similar); also credit for examples from Pompeii (e.g. Stabian Baths from 5th C BC when dependent on wells/rain water: very early hypocaust system; eventually developed usual suites of rooms for men & women)
- main problems: leakage: evidence of repair from imperial inscriptions: conflict between

practical and aesthetic issues, especially at city approaches; difficulties in maintaining underground channels; issues regarding use of gravity; breakdown of pumps & siphons; safety issues from collapse of substructure of pipes and passages beneath buildings of developing cities; credit for any evidence of how these were tackled; credit for outlining waste removal by drainage system; (e.g. Cloaca Maxima or other sewage/drainage channels in Rome; Pompeii had possible primitive drainage before romanisation; later some form of sewage removal from public latrines but much apparently still left running down streets).

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(30 marks)

Option D

- 13 **To what extent was the Pantheon superior to other Roman temples you have studied? Give reasons for your answer and refer to at least three other temples as well as the Pantheon.**

You might include discussion of

- **situation**
- **size and layout**
- **function**
- **materials and construction techniques**
- **external decoration**
- **use, lighting and decoration of the interior.**

Factors to consider in making this judgement might include:

- **situation: Pantheon:** (originally from 27 BC but renovated totally at about same time as Temple of Trajan above to move it away from earlier/contemporary examples in a number of respects) main approach through formal gateway; led into forecourt 55-60m wide & about twice as long; size of building spoke for itself – no need to set up on high podium etc. **other examples for comparison could include: Apollo/Pompeii:** (originally pre-Roman from 5th C BC, much modified in 2nd C BC, under restoration when Vesuvius erupted); site right in original city centre just outside forum; it sat on a high podium reached by steps from rectangular temple precinct (portico surrounded by 48 columns – one of earliest examples of precinct) **Cosa:** (2nd C BC) good site above city (to demonstrate Roman pre-eminence over Tuscans); ground levelled, then brick-built temple built on podium surrounded by stone wall; stone steps up to high (3.7m) podium; **Maison Carrée:** (from 16 BC in later formal style) set in squarish courtyard on 2.85 metre high podium, so less dominant position than earlier temples (return to Greek influence); propaganda for Augustus abroad **Mars Avenger:** (from 2 BC) sited high on podium; return to more Roman style by Augustus (for propaganda at home); attempt to seal his position & give thanks for victory over Caesar's assassins; temple fully integrated into design of Augustus' forum; sense of dominance increased by steep steps to approach; as Augustus did not dare demolish some private houses in the E corner, some asymmetry is apparent **Trajan:** (from 125 AD); very few remains but known from coin; believed to have been enormous building surrounded by a portico situated on the edge of Trajan's Forum (missed propaganda opportunity?)
- **size/layout: Pantheon:** fairly traditional frontage of eight unfluted grey Corinthian pillars (14 m high), plus two more at each side – very dramatic but quite standard; pronaos of three vaulted corridors divided by further 8 red inner columns; real surprise saved up for the interior; rotunda consisting of circular drum topped by hemispherical dome; oculus for light; shift of stress from exterior focus to interior (dome not visible externally from front); ultimate manifestation of Roman technological progress and self-confidence (and

- hence, the ultimate in propaganda) **Apollo Pompeii**: the whole building is peripteral; the single cella (situated unusually far back) was surrounded by an Ionic (later Corinthian) colonnade and fronted by six pillars; good early example of Roman development of Greek temple design **Cosa**: deep porch with façade of Tuscan columns and projecting side walls at cella end of porch; main temple building had blank walls and triple cella for statues of Capitoline triad; prominent tiled (terracotta) roof overhanging temple building on both sides for weather protection **Maison Carrée**: north-facing with 6 x 11 rows of Corinthian columns; masonry construction fully supported by columns; pseudoperipteral as half columns along cella sides; deep portico some third of length of temple; shallow ridge roof **Mars Avenger**: huge size (half as big again as nearby Temple of Venus) on high podium with frontal staircase; square plan with 8 solid white marble Corinthian columns on 3 sides (with pycnostyle spacing) backing on to precinct wall, so strong return to frontal focus; long cella leading to statues of Mars & Venus **Trajan**: coins show a huge octastyle building on a high podium flanked by distyle colonnades which curved behind the cella; degree of conjecture (is the temple depicted that of Trajan?) but if correct seems that 'bigger and the same' is the standard format for temple development
- *function*: **Pantheon**: presumed (from name) to have been temple to all gods; clearly had propaganda purpose (presumably different for each of its three phases) **Apollo Pompeii**: lost importance initially after Sulla's romanisation (80 BC) but regained prominence under Augustus who favoured Apollo **Cosa/ Maison Carrée**: basic temples for worship of roman triad (and associated propaganda effect on provincials) **Mars Avenger**: ceremonies were held here by generals setting off to war; also young men were awarded the toga virilis (symbol of manhood) here **Trajan**: almost certainly a giant temple in this, the last imperial forum, built to outdo in size, grandeur & propaganda value, all that had gone before
 - *materials/construction techniques*: **Pantheon**: granite columns in forecourt; main outer structure (on foundations of basalt) was tufa/brick/concrete faced with white marble; granite main columns had capitals & bases of marble; interior had floor of marble & granite; coffered ceiling of light pumice, lined with lead sheets; above was huge (43.2 m diameter) concrete dome; whole thing was marrying of structural & aesthetic detail; use of arches to support; cleverness of planning (lower section of 'dome' actually part of core structure); weight distribution through eight giant piers; adoption of techniques not generally applied to earlier temples **Apollo Pompeii**: surrounded on all sides by local tufa columns; **Cosa**: whole superstructure and roof framework made of wood; terracotta pediment figures as decoration above façade; all brightly coloured; despite materials and finish, essentially same style as T of Apollo with strong frontal emphasis **Maison Carrée**: shallow ridge roof; v-shaped channeling across walls; focus on exterior appearance but move away from frontal focus **Mars Avenger**: first Roman temple to be made entirely of marble, abutting on to tufa back wall of forum into which it was incorporated **Trajan**: the only survivals from the temple are the dedicatory inscription (in the Vatican) and one massive granite column (2m in diameter) with a white marble capital
 - *external decoration*: **Pantheon**: Pediment decoration now lost but probably had bronze sculpture of an eagle within a wreath; fairly plain frontage (marble faced) but huge inscription (from original version) naming M Agrippa as builder; frontal appearance suggested rectangular structure; rotunda not usually seen from front but gilded tiles on rotunda visible from higher ground **Apollo Pompeii**: surrounding columns originally grooved & with Ionic capitals; two statues of Apollo & Diana in forecourt; main structure had elegant Doric architrave of metopes and triglyphs resting on the columns (later transformed into a continuous frieze with griffins, festoons and foliage); all lost now **Cosa**: back & side walls blank; deep porch featured four Tuscan columns; above was wooden pediment with bright terracotta decoration (now lost) **Maison Carrée**: entablature very rich & sophisticated, with limestone decoration running all round building (Greek-style acanthus with repeated motifs, but rarely identical); appearance of

- columns running all round temple **Mars Avenger**: giant columns of gleaming marble would catch the eye; the pediment and its decoration are lost **Trajan**: not known
- *use/lighting/decoration of interior*. **Pantheon**: richness of interior materials; floor of marble and granite slabs; screens of pilasters and columns in various marbles (from all over Empire) and Porphyry filling lower half of walls; more marble above; the only source of light was the oculus at the dome's apex; this also serves for cooling & ventilating **Apollo Pompeii**: decoration lost but believed to have included: cult statues (Apollo/Diana); interior would have been dark (only accessible to initiates) **Cosa**: half walls at back of porch gave a 'from darkness to light' feel as visitor left cella; internal decoration (if any) lost – statues of triad would have been here for devotees to worship **Maison Carrée**: apparently quite plain interior; use probably as at Cosa **Mars Avenger**: statues of Mars & Venus inside the temple **Trajan**: not known
 - full credit for alternative examples to those suggested e.g. **Temple of Vesta** in the Forum, **Capitolium** at Ostia.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(30 marks)

Assessment Objectives Grid
Unit 2E Roman Architecture and Town Planning

Section 1

Either
Option A

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
01	1	0	1
02	1	0	1
03	1	0	1
04	2	0	2
05	5	5	10
06	8	12	20
TOTAL	18	17	35

Or
Option B

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
07	1	0	1
08	1	0	1
09	3	0	3
10	5	5	10
11	8	12	20
TOTAL	18	17	35

Section 2

Either
Option C

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
12	12	18	30
TOTAL	12	18	30

Or
Option D

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
13	12	18	30
TOTAL	12	18	30

OVERALL

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
TOTAL	30	35	65
%	46%	54%	100%

UMS conversion calculator www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion