



**General Certificate of Education  
June 2010**

**Classical Civilisation**

**CIV2E**

**Roman Architecture and Town Planning**

**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 candidates' 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 candidates' 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 candidates' 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](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2010 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres 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 centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

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 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>	Demonstrates <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>	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 use specialist vocabulary when appropriate.</li></ul>	<b>6-8</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	Demonstrates <b>either</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• a range of accurate and relevant knowledge</li></ul> <b>or</b> <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>	Demonstrates <b>either</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• some patchy accurate and relevant knowledge</li></ul> <b>or</b> <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>	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>19-20</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 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>	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>9-13</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> sufficient clarity, although there may be more widespread faults of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li></ul>	<b>5-8</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>1-4</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> 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>

**Mark Scheme**  
**Unit 2E Roman Architecture**

**SECTION ONE**

**Option A**

**01 Identify the areas marked 1, 2 and 3 on Plan A.**

1 = triclinium / dining room (1); 2 = tablinum / study / office / reception room (1); 3 = atrium / hall / living room / area (1)

(3 marks)

**02 Name two other buildings or areas associated with the House of the Menander.**

**Two from:** vegetable garden (1) / weavers' workshop(1) / brothel (1) / bar (1) / stables (1) / other attached private houses (1) / peristyle (1) / baths (1)

Credit (1) for any other correct rooms of the house.

(2 marks)

**03 To what extent was the expansion of the House of the Menander and its decoration typical of the way Pompeian domus developed?**

Answers may include discussion of a range (but not necessarily all) of e.g. House of the Menander built first as small but regular *atrium* house; credit for pointing out typical features of this original house (northern section of plan): e.g. *atrium* with *compluvium* & *impluvium* surrounded by standard range of rooms – *cubicula*, *exhedra*, *oecus* etc. credit for mentioning great expansion in 2<sup>nd</sup> C with addition of central *peristyle* (Hellenic influence) as new focal point; still generally typical of Pompeian *domus*; next period less typical as considerable expansion beyond standard features with excellent later style wall paintings by 79 AD as in only finest houses (e.g. Centaurs & Leucippids in one northern room; Diana & Actaeon in *triclinium*); *decoration*: two Corinthian capitals in tufo surmount entrance pilasters; *atrium* had hunting scenes in panels, with landscapes over doorways – also nice *lararium*; *exhedra* had scenes of Trojan War; *peristyle* had red-painted stuccoed columns (grandiose scale) with portraits of walls, flowers & herons between columns; supplementary areas during later phase included bath house, large new *triclinium*, considerable slaves' quarters etc; credit for mentioning mixing of business with domestic quarters (not all apparent from plan); e.g. stable yard in SE; also for expansion of house to subsume whole block (e.g. weavers', woodworkers' workshops) and as premises for cafes, brothels etc.; unusual addition / retention of large vegetable garden for self-sufficiency.

Credit any other reasonable points.

Credit for relevant references to other houses in comparison.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(10 marks)

**04 How effectively did the development of housing in Ostia meet the changing needs of its inhabitants? Refer to specific examples of housing in your answer.**

*You might include discussion of*

- *the circumstances in which insulae appeared in Ostia*
- *what insulae offered that the standard domus did not*
- *differences in the design of insulae*
- *when and why domus reappeared in Ostia.*

Answers may include discussion of a range (but not necessarily all) of e.g.

- 1<sup>st</sup> C AD change of function of Ostia from harbour town used for military sorties into chief port of Rome; vast increase in population during late 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> centuries AD; previously *domus* would be standard unit for wealthy classes; need now to house many more people – more wealthy & middle classes - but only limited area for physical growth and need to have workers etc. close to place of work; area still about size of Pompeii (approx 65 hectares); new solutions required
- examples where *domus* used initially to take increased population but only limited possibilities; *insulae* offered several storeys (3-5) and more compact apartments than *domus*; even for wealthy families (shared facilities rather than full range of rooms such as space-hogging *atria*, individual gardens, bath suites etc); also given lower status of many of workers in Ostia money could be saved on both materials (usually brick-faced concrete – *opus testaceum*) and construction techniques (simple unadorned rectangular blocks)
- pattern of this can be seen in examples of *insulae*: **Cassette-tipo**: one of earliest examples (c 100 AD); set in quarter for similar houses; usually two storeys; cheap construction in tufa (*opus reticulatum*); symmetrical blocks of living accommodation only (no shops); east entrance into communal corridor; surviving apartments reasonably spacious with mosaics and decorated walls; living room, bedrooms, kitchen; latrine, but no water supply; presumed relatively poor families. **House of Diana**: probably c 150 AD and less basic – rectangular block constructed in *opus latericium* around inner courtyard with water supply (cistern); three (possibly four) storeys; shops incorporated (on ground floor) as well as living accommodation; central corridor inside giving access to apartments; travertine stairway from entrance to first floor; apartments decorated with wall-paintings, mosaics etc; would have been dark and cramped however; inadequate windows and very close to housing opposite; external balconies carried on vaulting appear decorative rather than functional; integral Mithraeum on ground floor; large communal latrine. **Garden Houses**: similar time to House of Diana but more impressive accommodation; two identical blocks each divided by central corridor; effective use of space but very large apartments with full range of rooms; big communal garden in centre with six water fountains –water supply supplied to upper storeys ; suggestion here that wealthier families also settled for *insulae*; no shops incorporated
- as Ostia declined from c 250 AD the pressure on housing lessened and the *domus* made a return; best example **House of Amor & Psyche**: c 300 AD; took over from pre-existing building (*insula*?) on site; focus is roofed hall with 4 public rooms opening to west; all have underfloor heating; dominant large room up steps to north from hall; to east is courtyard garden with *nymphaeum*; smart decoration in geometric paving (*opus sectile*) marble panels etc.



Credit any other reasonable points.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme. (20 marks)

**Option B**

**05 Give the approximate date when the Forum Baths at Ostia were first built.**

**One from:** late 2<sup>nd</sup> C AD (1) / 150 – 200 AD (1) (1 mark)

**06 Name the areas marked 1 and 2 on Plan B.**

**1** *frigidarium* or cold room (1); **2** *caldarium* or hot room/hot bath (1) (2 marks)

**07 How was water supplied to the Forum Baths? Give two details.**

**Two from:** collected in cistern (1) from town aqueduct (1) / from subsoil (1) via waterwheel (1) on to rooms by (lead) pipes (1)

No need for correct connection between these ideas. (2 marks)

**08 How well did the design and decoration of the Forum Baths at Ostia meet the comfort and other needs of the users? Give specific details.**

Answers may include discussion of a range (but not necessarily all) of e.g. One of largest, certainly most central baths in Ostia; occupied large space (3,200 sq metres) directly SE of forum; added at period when town at peak of importance so luxurious; basic structure of bricks/tiles (*opus latericium*) – 4<sup>th</sup> C renovation featured tufa blocks (*opus vittatum*); entrances from side road originally but later (4<sup>th</sup> C) direct access from forum/palaestra; internal walls originally had marble revetment to height of approx 3 metres, plus smart black & white mosaics; décor greatly improved with addition of marble in 4<sup>th</sup> C rebuilding; suite well designed to avoid need to retrace steps within complex; first arrived from W or E at one of two matching pairs of *apodyteria*, between which was very imposing cross-vaulted *frigidarium*; *apodyteria* were well-lit (three windows); *frigidarium* feeling of space (probably 17 metres high), surrounded by v ornate marble columns; direct access from *frigidarium* into four main heated rooms: from west, ellipsoidally-vaulted *sudatorium* or sweat-room (with attached *heliocaminus* – octagonal sun-bathing room, heated by large windows), two adjoining *tepidaria* (fairly plain) and an ornate *caldarium* with three basins; hot rooms face SE to catch late a.m. / early p.m. sun; to east were the unseen rooms and facilities (furnaces, water supply etc.); very well laid-out *palaestra* is to south of main buildings; very ornate with marble columns after 4<sup>th</sup> C rebuilding; nearby was large *latrina* (more than 20 seats); credit for appropriate mention of usual ancillary services (bars, food stalls etc.).

Credit any other reasonable points.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme. (10 marks)

**09 How effectively did the Baths of Caracalla in Rome fulfil their purposes?**

**You might include discussion of**

- **the reasons why Caracalla began the Baths**
- **the layout of the Baths themselves and of the complex as a whole**
- **materials and structural techniques used**
- **decoration of the Baths**
- **range of facilities and amenities.**

Answers may include discussion of a range (but not necessarily all) of e.g.

- *context*: built new 211-216 AD as statement of imperial power as much as to service needs of public; resources available to maximize availability of materials, experts in construction etc.
- *planning*: crowding of buildings on the main *Via Appia* led to decision to create parallel street (*Via Nova*) to allow full effect of Baths to be appreciated; initial plans under Septimius Severus (finished by Caracalla) produced giant platform (100,000 sq metres), cisterns for water supply (total capacity 8.2 million litres) and central block of baths; design of central block based on that of Baths of Trajan – central block with *natatio*, *frigidarium* and *caldarium* aligned on central axis; decision taken to make *caldarium* circular-shaped; surrounding structures were added slightly later but before 235 AD; whole complex approx 225 x 185 metres x 35 metres high
- *materials*: for foundations earth/stone/mortar (150,000 cubic metres of earth excavated); substructures tufa/mortar/brick/landfill (280,000 cu metres tufa/mortar, 15 million pieces of brick, 330,000 cu metres of landfill); walls & vaults of concrete/brick (210,000 cu metres concrete, 5.6 million pieces of brick, 815,000 whole bricks); interior decoration marble/granite (inc 252 full column shafts weighing c 90 tons each); baths themselves of granite/basalt/alabaster; credit for details re sourcing of materials
- *construction*: long job (9,000 workmen over five years); existing buildings demolished and partly used as material for base; giant platform constructed on levelled site; must have used cranes (credit for detail, slave-worked wheel to haul stones to top etc.); huge main hall (with four entrances) built on platform, cross-vaulted in three bays, supported on massive piers; ornate columns not structurally necessary but made architectural statement; décor in all three was mix of statuary, exotic marble facing and mosaic work; giant *frigidarium* at centre (three cross vaults, bays in each corner with plunge baths, each decorated with two columns); great circular *caldarium* unique; *palaestra* in east wing open to sky with portico of Corinthian columns (grey Turkish granite) on three sides; three adjoining *exhedras* with exotic mosaic floors; further semi-circular *exhedra* connected this area with main suite; interior of baths was focal point of style but exterior not neglected; multi-tiered ranks of columns and niches to recall theatre frontages
- *alterations*: addition of outlying buildings c 235 AD marking basic completion of project; complex repaired by Diocletian c 300 AD; Constantine added apse to *caldarium* in early 4<sup>th</sup> C; in use until 6<sup>th</sup> C; basically (unlike other baths studied) arose in final form rather than representing development over time (other than that provided by the earlier baths elsewhere)
- *range of amenities*: huge enterprise - not just baths (as at provincial centre such as Pompeii or Ostia) but attempt to provide all manner of public leisure facilities (public libraries, shops, gardens, walks, fountains etc.); to be seen in context of series of imperial building schemes over 200 years each trying to emphasise grandeur of current dynasty by provision of bigger and better building projects than predecessors (most recently Baths of Trajan 104-109).

Credit any other reasonable points.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(20 marks)

## SECTION TWO

### Option C

- 10 **To what extent did the theatres and amphitheatres you have studied reflect the needs of those who commissioned them and to what extent did other factors play a part in their design? Refer to specific examples you have studied.**

**You might include discussion of**

- **why and when particular theatres and amphitheatres were built**
- **differences and similarities between theatres in layout, materials, structure and decoration**
- **differences and similarities between the amphitheatre at Pompeii and the Colosseum in Rome**
- **how far the design of theatres and amphitheatres provided for the needs of spectators and performers.**

Points for discussion might include some but **not** necessarily all of:

- **when & why – social/political: Pompeii** old pre-Roman township which became Roman colony in 80 BC; Great Theatre already built under Greek influence in first half of 2<sup>nd</sup> C BC; Pompeii provided with new amphitheatre in 1<sup>st</sup> C BC as well as updating of existing theatre (perhaps as a sign of centralized Roman influence); **Ostia** had long history of link with Rome (first Roman colony in late 3<sup>rd</sup> C BC); regular base for Roman navy but not important enough to gain permanent theatre until Augustan era when city rising in status as port of Rome; **Rome** as capital city had many temporary wooden arenas but no permanent theatre until Pompey's in 61 BC; Julius Caesar's rivalry demanded bigger, better theatre; didn't appear until about 11 BC as part of Augustus' renewal of Rome; following accession of Flavians Vespasian planned an amphitheatre to overshadow Augustus' theatre; completed by Titus as confirmation of dynasty's position.
- **differences & similarities – theatres: Pompeii: Great Theatre** – initially of unimposing appearance as (in Hellenistic style) built into hillside; capacity approx 3,000, big enough to hold most of population for festivals of drama etc; two tiers, close to old Triangular Forum with access from piazza (gathering area) alongside; cover provided by awnings on temporary basis as needed; major alteration early in Roman period (c 80 BC); third tier added bringing capacity to approx 5,000; access at top level from Triangular Forum; piazza lost to need for gladiator barracks to support new amphitheatre; **scaena** added to make more Roman; **Small Theatre** added at time of 80 BC changes to Great Theatre; covered with permanent roof; capacity only about 1,000 so not for mainstream performances; probably used for musical recitals & mimes; attractive design but hidden away somewhat. **Ostia: Theatre** again a sign of growth in Augustan era (opened c12 BC); provided with two easy ground floor access points as part of new commercial centre alongside Street of the Corporations; freestanding (unlike Pompeii Grand Theatre) in Roman rather than Greek idiom – availability of concrete a possible reason); capacity less than 4,000 despite population being larger than Pompeii's; had some of functions of amphitheatre (no amphitheatre provided at Ostia – proximity to

Rome?) – apparatus to flood for aquatic spectacles, also executions recorded; significant enlargement by Commodus (2<sup>nd</sup> C) and Septimius Severus & Caracalla in 3<sup>rd</sup> C; sign of continuing importance of city as port of Rome; freestanding nature of Theatre and its incorporation into more general building programme meant appearance more impressive; main façade formed by covered arcades with shops beneath them; in a smaller way similar in style to Theatre of Marcellus from similar time; arches with neat brick provide attractive ‘modern’ look suitable for town undergoing expansion. **Rome:** late compared to provinces in obtaining permanent arenas: accent on appearance and political message when finally came. **Theatre of Marcellus:** part of rebuilding programme to consolidate position of Augustus; grand three-tiered theatre opened at almost exactly same time as Ostia (13-11 BC); freestanding structure in prime position between Capitol hill & Tiber; capacity 20,500 as befitted capital city; allowed visitors to join locals (as at Pompeii); freestanding nature allowed large number of arched entrances to ease access and ensure social segregation (as Colosseum later).

- *differences and similarities – amphitheatres:* **Pompeii: Amphitheatre** – again added c 70 BC (earliest known permanent arena); on edge of town for use of other local towns (hence capacity of about 20,000 – and riot of 59 AD); strong emblem of Roman dominance; amphitheatre partly freestanding but exterior functional rather than decorative; several banks of external steps to ease access to higher tiers - taking away any aesthetic appeal? **Rome: Colosseum:** attempt of Flavian dynasty to outdo previous regime: begun by Vespasian in 70 AD; completed by son Titus in 80; clear inspiration from Theatre of Marcellus but question of scale; site dominating Forum; capacity 80,000; lasted in initial form until fire of 217 AD; main arena of empire; structure designed to impress as well as allow easy access via large number of arched entrances; decoration of three tiers according to orders of architecture makes impressive appearance.
- *needs of spectators/performers - internal organization:* **theatres:** Pompeii and Ostia similar; access to lower tiers from either side of *orchestra*; five rows of stairs then lead up from the *orchestra* to the seats; there is further access to higher tiers at both Great Theatre (from the higher ground level at back of theatre) & Ostia (from sets of external steps); design provided good acoustics, even for audience at top; tiered seating, without need for internal posts etc, plus the semi circular shape of the auditorium ensured uninterrupted views for all. **Amphitheatres: Pompeii:** poor access into arena – three tunnels only and with twists in passages; difficult to evacuate lower levels in emergency (setting of arena partly into city wall not a help) **but** outside steps give good access to higher tiers; no substructure to help organize entertainment; general shape and angle of tiering ensured a good view for all spectators; relatively small size meant all close enough to hear. **Rome: Colosseum** – controlled admission at one of many named entrances leading to complex series of corridors/stairways to appropriate level; circulation at all levels easy and safe because of large size of corridors allowed by internal design; substructure with cells, rooms and lift system aid the efficient presentation of the entertainment; despite huge size, the shape and design allowed even those at the top to have a clear view as well as providing acoustics appropriate to the types of entertainment.

Credit any other reasonable points.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(30 marks)

### Option D

#### 11 'A forum, with its associated buildings, reflected the particular needs of its city.'

*To what extent was this true of Pompeii, Ostia and Rome?*

*You might include discussion of*

- *when and why forums in these cities were built*
- *the layout of each forum and the buildings associated with it*
- *how social factors influenced the development of the forums*
- *the influence of political changes on the development of the forums.*

Points for discussion might include some but **not** necessarily all of:

- *when and why: **Pompeii:*** laid out originally in 2<sup>nd</sup> C BC (before Roman era); in centre of early, much smaller town; brought together administrative, religious and commercial buildings as well as providing focal point for citizens; heavily 'Romanised' in time of Augustus (still unfinished by eruption in 79 AD) by which time it occupied a place near the sea gate in the SW of the expanded town. **Ostia:** late on the scene; as at Pompeii was in centre of original smaller *colonia*, but appears to have been an open space (presumably for leisure) rather than a formal 'forum' until the imperial era; as with Pompeii the later (1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> C AD) city developed away from the forum area (entertainment and business centre in 'new' NE quarter). **Rome:** much more complex development; original forum, the *forum Romanum*, once a marshy valley but open general commercial, religious & entertainment area by 5 C BC; buildings erected to celebrate triumphs etc over following centuries; remained commercial centre when imperial fora built; *Forum of Augustus:* erected 25-2 BC just north of main forum; religious precinct (celebrating Emperor's exploits and prestige) rather than traditional 'forum'; *Forum of Trajan:* erected 106-113 AD; huge project to NW of main forum in line with many other major building projects; 'bigger & better' than any of predecessors' fora; again aiming at reflected glory.
- *layouts and buildings: **Pompeii:*** narrow rectangular piazza (124 x 466 feet) to N off main W-E street; had (originally plain) two-storey portico of tufa (Tuscan + Ionic orders) round three sides; statues all round with plinths supporting noticeboards etc; open central area; traditional mix of religion, business and administrative buildings; Basilica off to side at SW with three large admin buildings (forming the *curia*) in row along southern extremity of forum; in SE corner was *comitium* (for elections); parallel with western edge of forum was old Temple of Apollo with, to the north, vegetable market; more business buildings up east side (Eumachia – Clothmakers' Guild and *Macellum* – covered market) with Temple of Lares in between; northern end dominated by large Temple to Capitoline Triad; baths set behind to north; all framed by great view of Vesuvius. **Ostia:** also rectangular but wider than Pompeii; main road passed E-W through centre of forum; again had portico down both sides and N end again dominated by Capitolium (1<sup>st</sup> half 2<sup>nd</sup> C AD); Temple of Rome & Augustus opposite at S end – built under Tiberius (1<sup>st</sup> half 1<sup>st</sup> C AD), coinciding with formalization of forum; baths again close by (off SE corner); Basilica filled SW corner, along with attractive Templo Rotondo (with small but attractive peristyle facing forum); *curia* to NW (with House of Lares behind; just off N end are large market & *horrea Epagathia* (great & elegant warehouse); most of commercial activities however away from forum area (unlike Pompeii). **Rome:** *F. of Augustus:* formal entrance from SW facing raised Temple of Mars Avenger; colonnades (as at Pompeii/Ostia) down either side; but grandiose

scale & design; huge rear wall separated precinct from citizenry, rather than offering access to all; symmetrical with cross-axis formed by pair of semi-circular recesses; rich decoration – marble finish, large range of sculptures; all to impress rather than provide buildings of use to public. *F. of Trajan*: middle of 'golden age' of Rome in terms of prosperity so designed to reflect this; huge project digging into Quirinal hill; as with *F. of Aug*, great wall to close off from main forum just to S; main square paid for by conquest of Dacia & in suitably triumphal style; two long porticoes (112 metres long & clearly based on those in *F. of Aug*); square paved with huge blocks of Italian marble; focal point huge mounted statue of Emperor; giant Basilica Ulpia filled north side (furthest from main forum); *exhedra* main feature to east: entrance screened by 10 great (yellow) columns; interior had 2 high storeys; richly decorated throughout; upper storey had carvings of Trajan's triumphs; even more than *F. of Aug* designed to impress **but** Basilica Ulpia added further dimension: some civil buildings (law courts etc.) but also impressive space for practising imperial largesse; also space for record keeping (largest Basilica in Rome); **also** adjoining T.'s forum was Trajan's Market: series of commercial/residential buildings with latest brick-faced concrete construction, giving unity of design with forum; credit for further details.

- *social factors*: as indicated in key points above: in summary, **Pompeii**: forum there from start with all features (religious, commercial and administrative) as well as providing social meeting place; a true city centre, altered in Roman times but only in detail (e.g. replacement of tufa columns with richer marble in early imperial times). **Ostia**: more an open recreational space from beginning of colony until around time of destruction of Pompeii; only became 'forum' in mid 1<sup>st</sup> C AD and as part of programme of expansion which saw much of commercial life placed away in 'new' sector of town; heavily developed in later Empire (chance never afforded to Pompeii). **Rome**: imperial fora: *F. of Aug* in part replacement for forum Romanum (but this continued as a social, commercial and traditional religious centre); *F. of Trajan* too was addition rather than replacement but associated buildings (Basilica/Markets) did add social and commercial elements as necessary supplements in a growing city (rather like similar smaller-scale developments at Ostia).
- *political changes*: as indicated in key points above: in summary, **Pompeii**: ongoing signs of imperial desire to upgrade (to make political point) in time of early emperors (establishment of full range of typical colonial admin offices; improvements in materials etc); all to improve standards for wealthy town **but also** to let people know Rome was in charge. **Ostia**: again early empire showed confidence by creating traditional forum, while glory of later emperors was reflected by improvements (e.g. rebuilding of baths in 3<sup>rd</sup> and again in 4<sup>th</sup> C AD). **Rome**: *F. of Aug* almost totally demonstration of power (shift from republic); *F. of Trajan* even stronger political statement of increased power/wealth of Rome under his dynasty but incorporated recognition of social need for forum design to advance to offer facilities to match sophistication of the new Rome.

Credit any other reasonable points.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(30 marks)

**Assessment Objectives Grid**  
**Unit 2E Roman Architecture**

**SECTION ONE**

Either  
 Option A

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>01</b>	3	0	3
<b>02</b>	2	0	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	0	1
<b>06</b>	2	0	2
<b>07</b>	2	0	2
<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 TWO**

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>