

# A-LEVEL

# CLASSICAL CIVILISATION

CIV2E Roman Architecture and Town Planning  
Mark scheme

---

2020  
June 2014

---

Version/Stage: Final

---

---

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

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 from [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)

## 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 candidate 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 candidates after one year of study on the Advanced Subsidiary course and in the time available in the examination.

Candidates 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 candidate'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

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

## LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 20 MARKS

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

---

**LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 30 MARKS**

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

**This page has been left intentionally blank**

---

## Unit 2E Roman Architecture and Town Planning

### Section 1

#### Option A

**01 Identify the areas marked A, B and C on the plan.**

A = garden / peristyle (1); B = hall / *atrium* (1); C = dining room / *triclinium* (1).

(3 marks)

**02 Name two of the basic materials used to construct a *domus* at Pompeii.**

**Two from:**

tufa / stone (1) / brick (1) / cement (1) / wood (1).

(2 marks)

**03 To what extent do the design and decoration of the House of the Vettii suggest that its owners were wealthy?**

**Discussion might include:**

lots of evidence as one of best preserved *domus*; despite being on back street is in area close to forum, businesses, etc; had two entrances (main and side); lack of shops built into structure suggest little need for extra income – no entrances from main street similarly indicate little need to be ‘open to the masses’; main entrance lavishly decorated (credit throughout for ref to decoration); main atrium was large with marble *impluvium*; large family safes found here; two dining rooms (including *oecus* off atrium – only found in wealthy houses); usual bedrooms round *atrium* but again rich paintings in all (latest style wall-paintings of great sophistication); lack of *tablinum* suggests a house for leisure rather than business; corridor from main *atrium* to second entrance has staircase indicating upper storey to house; also separate room with latrine by side door; large servants quarters were round second *atrium*; large well-equipped kitchen also here; water supply to house was modern and sophisticated: much focus may be on large peristyle and garden area, lavishly adorned with statues, complex water features etc.; credit for introducing evidence to suggest quality of house deteriorated in work done between 62 AD earthquake and 79 AD eruption.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(10 marks)



**04 To what extent do other *domus* at Pompeii and Herculaneum show variety in their designs and decorations?**

**Give reasons for your answer and refer to at least three examples of *domus*. Do not discuss the House of the Vettii.**

**You might include discussion of:**

- **position, size and original layout**
- **materials and techniques of construction**
- **any changes over time**
- **gardens**
- **decoration.**

*Points to consider might include some but not necessarily all of the following:*

- *general:* most have reasonably clear history, eg *Pompeii*: **House of Sallust**: a very early *atrium* house dating from the 4th Century BC but with big expansion in 2<sup>nd</sup> Century BC; **House of the Faun** (2<sup>nd</sup> Century BC during Samnite period); **House of Pansa** (also Samnite period); **House of Tragic Poet** (again from Samnite period); **House of Loreius Tiburtinus** (believed from Sullan period); **House of the Menander**, late 1<sup>st</sup> Century BC; *Herculaneum*: **House of Mosaic Atrium**, 1<sup>st</sup> Century BC but heavily rebuilt not long before 79 AD destruction; **House of Stags**, ditto; credit for using any of these to compare size, development or any of the other bullet points below as per the question
- *position / size / layout:* **position:** *Pompeii*: **Sallust** in NW corner of city near Herculaneum Gate; **Faun**: great position just along from N entrance to forum on one of main roads of city, close to baths; **Pansa**: just along from House of Faun, again excellent position just off N end of forum; **Tragic Poet**: next door to House of Pansa; **Loreius T**: at other end of city from all previous *domus*: on main W E street of city in the eastern sector (near Sarno Gate); **Menander**: away from main E W street in central southern area of city, near Stabian Baths; like House of Loreius T, it was situated in later non-Samnite area of city; **size:** Sallust was at least initially smaller; **Pansa** and **Tragic Poet** middling size; others bigger eg **Loreius T**; two very big – **Faun**, **Menander**; **layout:** good eg of 'standard' *domus* would be **Pansa** (credit for briefly explaining standard *atrium* – *tablinum* – *hortus* axis;) **Tragic Poet** quite similar; had second storey now lost (like Vettii); kept similar layout throughout existence; **Sallust** originally very much based on *atrium* with peristyle added later (along with second *atrium*); six shops built into west side **Loreius T** basically standard but expanded to take over almost whole block; **Faun** kept basic shape but built on bigger scale and with *atrium* combined with peristyle (plus 2 *tablina*); occupied a whole city block; had private baths; a number of shops at front; **Menander** similar to Loreius T, but massive expansion in all directions absorbing whole block (high density housing); credit for mentioning mixing of business with domestic quarters eg stable yard, weavers and woodworkers workshops, etc.; credit where these factors are used to draw appropriate comparisons: *Herculaneum*: **Mosaic Atrium** essentially sea front villa developed massively in about 62 AD; has only a *tablinum* attached to the *atrium* with main living quarters at a higher level on the far side of huge peristyle garden; **Stags**: similar development; even richer than Mosaic Atrium; represents final phase of growth away from basic *atrium* building; 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
- *materials construction:* general: basic materials same at all houses: main structure of tufa blocks (first noted as material used for House of **Sallust** in 4<sup>th</sup> Century BC); brick, cement and wood also used where appropriate; credit for mentioning tendency to use poor quality

masonry such as *opus craticium* in later stages; problems of collapses from general increase in 1<sup>st</sup> floor accommodations; walls were generally plastered; stucco was often used to decorate columns etc.; main differences between houses will be in luxury materials: eg marble, precious metals, etc. credit for any examples, also for any basic construction techniques explained

- *gardens: Pompeii: Sallust*: built without garden but peristyle built in 2<sup>nd</sup> Century BC; this was expanded right up to 79 AD; **Faun**: basic peristyle in usual place beyond *tablinum*, but huge second garden area at rear for entertainment; **Pansa**: the traditional peristyle in its traditional position; not developed into anything more elaborate; **Tragic Poet**: large open peristyle; quite traditional like House of Pansa; **Loreius T**: standard peristyle but long porticoed corridor beyond leading to indoor walled garden with running water, fruit trees etc.; **Menander**: grandiose peristyle with stuccoed Doric columns; as with House of Sallust, original small house was *atrium*-based; peristyle added later; *Herculaneum*: **Mosaic Atrium**: huge peristyle garden dominating the house around it and acting as communication between the two halves; **Stags**: garden on axis allowing sea views through pergola; grand dining room incorporated in garden; again garden even more focal point of house than in any Pompeian examples
- *decoration*: credit for general discussion of decoration; candidates may point out the quality and quantity of paintings in, say, House of Faun, House of Tragic Poet; statues in, say, House of Stags; also for discussion of famous mosaics, etc. where used to draw comparisons as in the question.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(20 marks)

### Option B

#### 05 At about what date was the Colosseum completed?

80 AD +/- 10 years (1).

(1 mark)

#### 06 Name three materials used in the construction of the Colosseum.

**Three from:**

Travertine or limestone (1) / tufa (1) / concrete (1) / brick (1) / tiles (1) / marble (1) / gravel (1) / wood (1) / sand (1).

(3 marks)

#### 07 What was the shape of the Colosseum?

Oval / elliptical (allow circular) (1).

(1 mark)

**08 How successful, in your opinion, was the external design of the Colosseum?****Discussion might include:**

built by Flavian Emperors to impress foreigners (possibly to outshine Theatre of Marcellus?); also to keep locals happy by providing the ultimate place for entertainment; completed by Titus 80 AD on much greater scale than any previous arena (capacity approx 50,000); sited at dominant point by Forum, so would need to impress visitors and locals alike; size was impressive (188 x 156 metres in diameter; 48 metres high); the outer wall showed off the four storeys (lower three embodying the orders of architecture, working upwards Doric, Ionic and then Corinthian) topped by an 80-bay plain wall enlivened by Corinthian pilasters; each of the three pillared floors featured 80 arches flanked by engaged columns and faced in travertine and marble; statues stood in each archway; exterior arrangement was practical as well as breathtaking; the size and number of arches allowed controlled access, aided by the issuing of tickets; so entry (and exit) fast and safe; the strict Roman class divisions could be easily maintained by controlling access by specific entrances with no intermingling of classes; on the other hand replacing Nero's private garden with an attractive public recreational facility.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(10 marks)

**09 'The amphitheatre at Pompeii fulfilled its functions less effectively than the Colosseum in Rome did.'**

**To what extent do you agree? Give reasons for your answer and refer to both amphitheatres.**

**You might include discussion of:**

- **the social and political reasons for their construction**
- **their siting and appearance**
- **their design, use of materials and construction techniques**
- **health and safety**
- **provision of different kinds of facilities and entertainment.**

*Points to consider might include some but not necessarily all of the following:*

- *reasons:* In 80 BC the Samnite influence over **Pompeii** had just been seen off by Sulla after a bitter war; the new rulers wanted to put their stamp on the city so pursued building programme; 2 magistrates (the same ones who had just built the small theatre) saw to the construction of the amphitheatre (the earliest amphitheatre known) in an eastern part of the city well away from the original town centre; hence two main reasons: social (to get people on board by providing games) and political (show of Roman authority; also at lower level, attempt by magistrates to court popularity); in **Rome** the Flavian dynasty was still not fully secure; in 70 AD Vespasian, probably inspired by the Julian Theatre of Marcellus (a propaganda triumph for Augustus), proposed the biggest and grandest amphitheatre; following his death it was all the more important for his son Titus, to see it was finished; again, double aim: to find favour with the people by providing great spectacles; also to impress all visitors, merchants, dignitaries etc., thus cementing the Flavian regime
- *siting / appearance:* arches and accompanying engineering skills yet to be fully developed when amphitheatre at **Pompeii** built; the population was nothing like as large as Rome and the propaganda importance of the siting and appearance much less vital; no attempt to adorn the exterior (bricks left on view) which consisted of a series of plain arches on the sides not built into the walls; rising sets of staircases were functional rather than

attractive; generally squat appearance (sunk below ground level) and hard to see from many angles because of the walls; capacity of 20,000 was a quarter that of the Colosseum; with dimensions of 135 x 104 metres, it was much smaller than the Colosseum (188 x 156); at **Rome** a central position was adopted near Nero's Colossus (dig at previous regime); much more impressive as freestanding and dominating the forum and other areas where the great and good would gather; credit for using information from Q08 only where focused on answering the comparative question

- *materials / construction*: at **Pompeii** the materials were basic; there was no attempt to face the exterior with marble; instead concrete faced with *opus incertum* was used, giving strength but not utilising the later techniques of supported vaulted passages or subterranean cells; buttresses were also used and building onto city walls gave further strength, but at the expense of grandeur (and convenience as twisted entry / exit passages had to be incorporated); basic frame had arches but these were blind, offering no access to the interior; the sets of exterior steps were narrow and for the spectators sitting on the lower seats (mainly the higher classes) two small tunnels led to a small circulation area and thence to railed off rows for the elite, but this would have been quite cramped even for the top people; at **Rome** similar materials were used for the core **but** here a huge elliptical concrete ring was topped with blocks of travertine from which the supporting piers rose; then the outer wall was added with columns faced with marble etc. (see 08 above); again brief detail of Colosseum's outward appearance may be credited as long as it fitted to the comparison with Pompeii's amphitheatre
- *health / safety*: at **Pompeii** there were issues both external and internal; despite the basic soundness of the structure, the narrow staircases (used by most of the common people) were inadequate in case of emergency (credit for reference to the disaster of 59 AD); the solid banks allowed only the two entrances for those seated lower; again these would have been inadequate in case of emergency; inside filtering down (or up) was by narrow rows of steps bringing further likely congestion; once seated however, the proximity to the arena may well have been a point in Pompeii's favour; awnings were provided to protect from sun; in **Rome** the existence of 80 arched entrances allowed controlled access; once inside, circulating passages led all round with regular flights of stairs leading to the higher seating areas; despite the size no spectator had to climb far to their seat once at the correct level; the top level was made of wood (possible fire hazard), but generally the marble seating as more comfortable and gave a great view from anywhere in the building; awnings here too
- *entertainment*: credit for brief mention of the fights, animal hunts etc. put on in both but emphasis must be on architectural influences; eg substructure beneath Colosseum not found beneath Pompeii amphitheatre; credit for showing knowledge of cells, cages, lifts etc. in the former; also the effect of these differences on health and safety of both the public and performers.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(20 marks)

## Section 2

### Option C

#### 10 'The design and uses of the forum at Pompeii were very different from those of the Forum of Augustus and the Forum of Trajan in Rome.'

To what extent do you agree? Give reasons for your answer and refer to these forums and their associated buildings.

You might include discussion of:

- when, where and why each forum was built
- the layout of each forum and its associated buildings
- business and social uses
- religious and political uses.

Points to consider might include some but not necessarily all of the following:

- *when / where / why built*: **Pompeii**: *Pompeii*: laid out in 2<sup>nd</sup> Century BC to act as focus of pre-Roman town; although later (Roman) development to N and E left the forum in the original (and irregularly planned) SW corner of the city, it was central when built; 'new' forum built to provide dual focus – (mainly) religious buildings at one end, business and political buildings at the other; **Rome**: two of the most important developments of new forums (near to but not part of the original forum) were the *Forum of Augustus* (built 25-2 BC to north of main forum) and the *Forum of Trajan* (106-113 AD) NW of the main forum; huge project to dig land out of Quirinal Hill
- *layout / buildings* **Pompeii**: *Pompeii*: narrow (142 x 38 metres) open piazza with two-storey portico round W, S and E sides; central area open (possibly grassed) and filled with statues, platforms, notice boards, etc.; Capitolium on high podium dominated northern; forum baths were just behind; buildings down E side included (from N-S) macellum (covered market), Sanctuary of Lares, Temple of Vespasian and Eumachia building (possibly wool or cloth market); opposite the macellum down W side was cereals / vegetable market; then heading S, room for stalls, small shops etc; Temple of Apollo and Basilica were on this side but just outside main forum; the S side had (alongside basilica) three civic offices (political institutions) thought to have been the *comitia*, *curia* and junior magistrates offices; **Rome**: *Forum of Augustus*: similarities to Pompeii in basic layout (but huge difference in scale): entry (from SW) opened up view of raised Temple of Mars Avenger; colonnades down two longer sides; no roads crossing, but symmetrical shape emphasized by cross-axis formed by pair of semi-circular recesses; stronger emphasis on appearance as opposed to practical use – rich decoration throughout; marble everywhere; *Forum of Trajan*: main square again flanked by two porticoes (112 metres long and copied from Forum of Augustus); marble paving in square; **but** forum divided by gigantic Basilica Ulpia – no access to (or even sight of) Trajan's Temple from square; at same time Trajan's Market constructed nearby (not technically part of forum but clearly closely linked); overall quality of buildings, decoration, etc. designed to surpass Forum of Augustus
- *social / business*: **Pompeii**: clear evidence that this forum fulfilled both these purposes: well positioned for people to gather; meeting places and notice boards provided in open spaces; stalls and shops in open areas plus range of markets, warehouses, workers' guilds etc.; see above for relevant buildings for discussion; **Rome**: distinction between the two forums: *Forum of Augustus*: apparently little attempt to replicate social or

business activity of smaller towns (main forum remained nearby for these purposes?); access not as open as to forums in the smaller towns (huge rear wall formed a barrier – producing sense of exclusivity?); no markets provided although wide spaces presumably encouraged socialisation; *Forum of Trajan*: more direct business provision: Basilica Ulpia provided huge covered area for people to meet and do business; it incorporated the public records office etc.; the nearby Trajan’s Market provided big range of modern commercial (as well as residential) buildings

- *religious / political: Pompeii*: array of temples within and near to forum (credit for bringing out political significance of dates built, etc.); basilica for law; set of offices providing political focus; see above for relevant buildings: **Rome**: *Forum of Augustus*: temple clearly provided religious grandeur; also provided demonstration of political power (necessary for the fledgling empire); *Forum of Trajan*: Trajan’s temple, although detached, apparently outdid Augustus’ in size and beauty; Basilica Ulpia with civil buildings had practical purposes (above) but as a magnificent two storeyed building (entrance screened by 10 great columns) was clearly also designed for political effect (could be said to combine propaganda use of F of Aug with practical uses found at Ostia and Pompeii?).

*Students will not be expected to include all details; credit will be given for attempts to use a selection of information relating to forums to establish the level of difference between Rome and Pompeii*

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(30 marks)

### Option D

#### 11 ‘Temples within the city of Rome were very different from those in other Roman cities.’

**To what extent do you agree? Give reasons for your answer and refer to at least two temples from the city of Rome and two from other cities.**

**You might include discussion of:**

- **when and why each temple was built**
- **size and position**
- **design, materials and construction techniques**
- **religious, social and political uses.**

*Points to consider might include some but not necessarily all of the following:*

- *time / reasons: Rome*: (credit also any ref to Temple of Trajan) *Vesta*: probably on cult site from 7<sup>th</sup> Century BC; original temple probably from 6<sup>th</sup> Century BC but burned down on number of occasions; final version from 191 under Septimius Severus but appears that reconstructions were reasonably true to original form (based on traditional hut shape); *Portunus*: originally built in 2<sup>nd</sup> Century BC in honour of god of keys, livestock and harbours as overlooks bend in river Tiber where barges came in; completely rebuilt in 1<sup>st</sup> Century BC; *Mars Avenger*: Octavian vowed to built it after Philippi (42 BC) but only did so (as Emperor Augustus) after recovering lost standards in 20 BC; built on land he had bought; *Pantheon*: original temple from 27 BC but total rebuild under Hadrian in 118-128 AD; another step in sequence of each emperor striving to outdo predecessors?

Credit for pointing out that even within Rome temples were built for very different reasons: **elsewhere**: (credit also Capitulum Pompeii) *Apollo Pompeii*: early temple of 5<sup>th</sup> Century BC built long before Roman influence felt in the city; cult of Apollo imported from Greece when Greek influence strong in S Italy; rebuild in 2<sup>nd</sup> Century BC, again before Rome took over; little done under Romans (who built Capitol as main change around the forum); *Capitolium Cosa*: Cosa was an early Roman colony (from 273 BC) in Tuscany; distant from Rome so temple set up as symbol of Roman influence in first half of 2<sup>nd</sup> Century BC *Maison Carrée*: another Roman colony this time outside Italy (France); built 16 BC in honour of Augustus' nephews Gaius and Lucius; also as mark of Roman dominance; *Capitolium Ostia*: built 120 AD (similar time to Pantheon) under Hadrian; similar motivation to other Capitolia even though this one very close to Rome; dominates the forum of Ostia (as with Capitolia at Cosa and Pompeii)

- **size / position: Rome: Vesta**: small (15 metres diameter) non-standard temple in main forum adjacent to House of Vestals; site chosen for this proximity rather than to make a particular impression; pointed east to face sun; *Portunus*: another small but more standard temple on high podium to overlook Forum Boarium (site of original village of Rome; later cattle market); *Mars Avenger*: huge imperial temple on high podium and integrated into design of Augustus' forum; dominated whole new city centre; *Pantheon*: very large imperial temple but away from main forum area, not raised up and fairly standard when viewed from the front: **elsewhere: Apollo Pompeii**: reasonably small temple set on high podium in own precinct just outside the forum; impressive but rather out of the way compared to temples inside forum; *Capitolium Cosa*: small temple but set in prominent position high up above main forum, ground levelled then temple set on 3.7 metre-high podium; *Maison Carrée*: fairly large temple set in rectangular courtyard in centre of provincial capital; placed on podium but only 2.85 metres high; appeal due to design as much as position; *Capitolium Ostia*: large enough to dominate forum, especially as raised up on high podium at the intersection of the two main roads of the city
- **design / materials / construction: Rome: Vesta**: unusual in being round temple; very simple design kept during multiple rebuildings; latest rebuilding featured central cella with 20 (Corinthian) columns spaced evenly around; the podium consisted of four strata of concrete faced with *opus incertum* and brick; at the sides are tufa blocks (foundations for the marble steps; the outside featured marble facing (now largely stripped); *Portunus*: standard rectangular temple consisting of a tetrastyle portico and cella; many similarities to Maison Carrée although on higher podium; pseudoperipteral with cella at rear, porch had four frontal columns and two at sides (with five half columns set in to each side of the cella); built of tufa and travertine with stucco surfaces; *Mars Avenger*: huge (half as big again as near neighbour Temple of Venus); fairly standard square plan with eight solid white marble Corinthian columns on three sides backing on to precinct wall (first temple made completely of marble); strong frontal focus; long cella containing statues; splendor through size and materials rather than innovation; *Pantheon*: traditional frontage of eight Corinthian pillars (plus two at each side); porch of 3 corridors divided by eight inner columns, but this led to great innovation (rotunda); circular drum topped by hemispherical dome (with oculus for light in centre); tufa / brick / concrete for main outer structure (marble-faced); dome (43.2 metres diameter) of concrete; coffered ceiling of light pumice with lead lining; **elsewhere: Apollo Pompeii**: peripteral temple with single cella set at back; high podium revealed frontage of six Corinthian columns of tufa, contrasting with ionic pillars of colonnade; similarities to Temple of Portunus; all decoration lost but was latterly continuous frieze with griffins and foliage; *Capitolium Cosa*: deep porch with Tuscan columns and projecting side walls at cella end; blank walls; v unusual in that superstructure and roof made of wood; terracotta pediment figures above façade; strong frontal focus (mini version of Temple of Mars Avenger in

that sense) *Maison Carrée*: Augustan formal style; rectangular layout length 2 x width); built of large stone blocks, marble-faced; pseudo peripteral design (as T of Portunus); hexastyle arrangement with 6 frontal Corinthian columns and 11 to side; shallow ridge roof; entablature v rich and sophisticated (local limestone); move away from frontal focus; *Capitolium Ostia*: another typical free standing hexastyle temple on tall podium; made of local materials but lots of marble facings (and floor); three rooms for statues of triad within cella; see other hexastyle temples for further general points

- *religious / social / political uses: Rome: Vesta*: ancient cult centre; home of Vesta's (undying) flame so key religious significance; also the home of the palladium (sacred statue); wills of Roman senators were stored inside; safety of temple seen as linked with safety of Rome;

*Portunus*: dedicated to god of harbour and trade so very appropriate here for religious and social needs; no known political significance, although adjacent to spot where Romulus was traditionally washed up; *Mars Avenger*: contained statues of Mars and Venus but presumably as much devoted to emperor worship; ceremonies held here by generals heading off to war; young men awarded *toga virilis* here; *Pantheon*: clearly rebuilding brought great propaganda value to Hadrian; 'pantheon' suggests building for worship of all gods; otherwise little known about uses; **elsewhere**: *Apollo Pompeii*: dedicated to Apollo (statues of Apollo and Diana in precinct); no known social / political uses although its subordination to new Capitolium was a sign of Roman authority; *Capitolium Cosa*: basic religious use for worship of Capitoline triad and associated physical / political effect on locals; *Maison Carrée*: same points as Cosa, but extra political significance as dedicated to Emperor's nephews; *Capitolium Ostia*: same again, but believed also used for housing city treasury and archives.

*Students will not be expected to deal with all of these temples or necessarily cover all the bullet points; credit will be given for covering a range of comparative features between Rome and elsewhere.*

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**

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>01</b>	3	-	3
<b>02</b>	2	-	2
<b>03</b>	5	5	10
<b>04</b>	8	12	20
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>35</b>

**Or  
Option B**

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>05</b>	1	-	1
<b>06</b>	3	-	3
<b>07</b>	1	-	1
<b>08</b>	5	5	10
<b>09</b>	8	12	20
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>35</b>

**Section 2****Either  
Option C**

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>10</b>	12	18	30
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>30</b>

**Or  
Option D**

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>11</b>	12	18	30
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>30</b>

**OVERALL**

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>100%</b>