General Certificate of Education
June 2011

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 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.

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

Level 4   Demonstrates
- 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
- 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
- a range of accurate and relevant knowledge

or
- some relevant opinions with inadequate accurate knowledge to support them.

3-5

Level 1   Demonstrates
either
- some patchy accurate and relevant knowledge

or
- 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
- 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
- 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.

19-20

Level 4 Demonstrates
- 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
    has a generally analytical and/or evaluative focus,
    is broadly appropriate to the question,
    mainly supports comment with detail and
    has a discernible structure
    is generally clear and coherent, using appropriate, generally accurate language and
    generally makes use of specialist vocabulary when appropriate.

14-18

Level 3 Demonstrates
- 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
- **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
- **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 Demonstrates
- 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
  - 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 Demonstrates
- 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
  - 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 Demonstrates
- 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 Demonstrates
- **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 Demonstrates
- 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

Mark Scheme
Unit 2E   Roman Architecture and Town Planning

Section One
Option A

01   *Identify the features labelled A, B, C and D on the plan.*

A = Statue (of Trajan) (1); **B** = Basilica (Ulpia) (1); **C** = Library (1); **D** = Temple (of Trajan) (1)

(4 marks)

02   *When was this forum built?*

112 AD (+ or – 5 years) (1)

(1 mark)

03   *How well did the layout, materials and decoration of the forum celebrate Trajan's achievements?*

Discussion might include: last of a series of (five) imperial fora, all seeking to make a mark on behalf of the latest Emperor; built as focal point in capital city to impress with spoils from Dacian War; range of buildings all designed to have great impact and reflect military prowess of Trajan (e.g. Trajan's Column, similarities to design of legionary *principia*; figures of Dacian prisoners etc.); scale also impressive - cut out level space (to depth of 125 feet maximum) approximately 220x130 yards, with three fifths of area open space; open area flanked on both sides with long porticoes, each broken up by a large semi-circular exedra; colonnades decorated with caryatid figures of Dacian prisoners and large roundels; entrance to forum was by great arch topped with six-horse chariot; focus from entrance was huge equestrian statue of Emperor in centre of open space; great opulence of statues on top of colonnades (lavish use of marble), all dedicated to Trajan's triumphs; at far end of forum was Basilica Ulpia (huge transverse hall): twice as long as broad; 400 feet long; timber roof (80 feet span); apse at either end; columns of grey Egyptian granite; interior faced with range of marble features; ceiling covered in sheets of gilded bronze; dramatic entrance porch facing open area of forum; Trajan's column (125 feet high; drums of Carrara marble; bronze statue of Emperor on top; tomb intended for Emperor in base) was situated behind the Basilica, with libraries to either side (brick-faced concrete): quite plain & functional compared to forum; great spiral frieze of Trajan's victories on column; (credit for reference to Temple of Trajan - known only from coins – despite likelihood of later date: enormous octastyle design; tall podium; set against semi-circular rear wall; huge Egyptian granite columns - one survives); credit for relating grandeur and opulence of all above to desire of imperial family for recognition and idea of buildings as propaganda; also social implications of nearby market, in a sense an extension of the forum, but visually and structurally separate.

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

04   *How well did the forum at Pompeii suit the needs of the city?*

You might include discussion of
- *the location of the forum*
- *the range of buildings in and around the forum*
- *the religious needs of the city*
- *the political needs of the city*
- *the commercial and social needs of the city.*

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

- the reasons for the forum being developed in the SW corner rather than centre of city (laid out in 2nd C BC in what was centre of pre-Roman town; later expansion to north & east left forum apparently away from 'centre'); Italic style of development with one end predominantly religious, the other political/business; great example of Romanisation of previously Greek city
- religious buildings: clear importance as shown by number and positioning of religious buildings; Temple of Apollo adjoined the forum to the west & predated it; most dominant temple was the Capitolium (on high podium looking south down forum and providing strong visual axis): to the east (opposite T of Apollo) was a Sanctuary to the Lares (built in response to earthquake in 62 AD) and (next to it) the Temple of Vespasian built just before the final destruction: even the business premises had religious connotations (e.g. Eumachia building dedicated to *Concordia Augusta et Pietas*); credit for details relevant to needs of city and/or people; also further temples positioned close to forum (Augusta & Venus Fortuna)
- political needs: S E corner of forum given over to political institutions; close together here are the *comitium*, used as a voters' hall (in SE corner) and chief magistrates' office, *curia* (council chamber) and junior magistrates' office (in a line along the south end); to the south west the Basilica combined politics, law & order and business in its uses (credit for relevant detail on any of these); large number of statues of important people
- business needs: north eastern side buildings largely for business: large provision market in NE corner; cloth traders' hall (Eumachia building) dominating central eastern flank; opposite in NW corner was the cereals market (with weights and measures office nearby) while the open space of the forum would be filled with temporary stalls – banks, small traders etc.
- social needs: nearly all the above buildings were set back outside the open forum allowing space for circulation; daily notice board acted as early 'newspaper'; two-storeyed stone portico down both sides and south end made pleasant surroundings for social interaction (as well as business); entrance arches kept traffic out as well as adding sense of importance to the area; again credit for any detail relevant to the title (forum baths nearby etc.).

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

Option B

05   *What is the shape of this amphitheatre?*

Oval (allow circular or similar) (1)

(1 mark)

06   *When was this amphitheatre built?*

70 BC (+ or – 5 years) (1)

(1 mark)

07   *Identify three of the materials used to construct this building.*

Three from: Travertine stone (1) / tufa (1) / brick (1) / concrete (1) / earth (1) / wood (1) /
sand (1)

(3 marks)

08   *How successful were the design and construction of the amphitheatre at Pompeii in*
ensuring the safety of the spectators?

Discussion might include: early building, so issues of safety not fully thought out; need to
allow approximately 20,000 spectators to enter, move around and leave in safety; height
deceptive as the arena was built at a lower level than the surrounding ground; earth removed
from this lowering of the arena level was used to form the banks (initially covered in wood
seating – fire risk – but later replaced with stone; bank supported on outside by concrete
faced with *opus incertum* (solid and stable so good safety feature); buttresses gave further
stability, with arches adding extra support; as arches were blind there were a very restricted
number of entrances (not good from safety point of view); unlike later examples, the banks
were solid, not allowing the series of internal passageways (as in the Colosseum, for
example) which were a major safety feature elsewhere; some thought was given to access
to the two lower tiers for wealthy citizens: two small tunnels led to a small circulation area and
thence into these rows which were separated by barriers from both the arena and spectators
in higher tiers; the two bigger tunnels led directly to the arena, so provided good access for
performers (keeping them away from the people) but afforded no real access for spectators;
they used the steep and cramped exterior staircases which must have been bottlenecks in
the event of an emergency; filtering down from the high entry point was by narrow rows of
steps between the seats which again did not offer a speedy exit when trouble arose: credit for
understanding the limitations of safety, but also for the positive features of an early example
from which much was learnt and incorporated in later amphitheatres; credit for knowledge of
the riot in 59 AD if applied to the question.

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

09 *'The Colosseum was a perfect amphitheatre.' How far do you agree with this statement?*

You might include discussion of
- *its function, size and location*
- *its external and internal appearance*
- *access*
- *facilities for spectators and performers*
- *seating arrangements.*

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

- begun by Vespasian in 70 AD; completed by son Titus in 80; clear inspiration from Theatre of Marcellus (attempt by Flavian dynasty to cap previous regime) but on much grander scale; site chosen near Colossus and Golden House of Nero to dominate Forum; capacity of 80,000 much bigger than any before (further evidence it was to impress: gladiatorial combats first started in 3rd C BC but reached their peak of popularity in the early empire; providing games was a way to win public support as the mob could forget hunger, poverty etc.
- in line with need to impress the external appearance was huge and impressive: 188 x 156 metres in size; 48 metres high; supported by huge elliptical ring of concrete topped with blocks of travertine from which rise the supporting piers; an outer wall provided the 'wow' factor: built with four storeys, the lower three embodied the orders of architecture – (from the bottom) Doric, Ionic & Corinthian – with the fourth a plain wall of 80 bays; these corresponded to the 80 arches flanked by engaged columns on each of the lower floors; all faced in marble and with statues in each archway it gave the desired effect; huge scale of internal corridors would impress; ditto use of marble throughout
- access was afforded via this large number of arched entrances on the lower floor; these were named and admission (using tickets) could be controlled in this way, keeping access (and escape if necessary) speedy, safe and comfortable; immediately inside the entrances spectators found themselves in wide circulation passages
- from these passages corridors led to the ground floor seats and staircases to the higher levels; circulation at all levels was easy and safe because of the large size of these corridors and the provision of wide staircases at frequent intervals; despite the high capacity no spectator had to climb too far up the internal tiers of seats, although the top level (reserved for the poorest spectators) was partly built of wood and less safe and comfortable than lower down; conversely more comfortable seats with separate access were provided at the front of the ground level seating area for 'top people', as well as a 'royal box' for the imperial family and honoured guests
- the spacious passageway allowed provision of a range of facilities for spectators (credit for sensible examples) while the awning (planned carefully into the initial design) kept the direct sun off them; for performers comfort was not generally an issue but a cleverly designed substructure with cells, rooms and a lift system directly onto the arena aided the efficient presentation of the entertainment: credit for brief reference to non-architectural provision (food, services etc.).

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

Section Two

Option C

10 *How satisfactorily did Pompeii and Ostia solve their different housing problems?*
Refer to specific examples of housing from both towns in your answer.

You might include discussion of
- *issues of population growth in each town at various times*
- *the ways in which domus developed*
- *reasons for developing insulae and similar housing*
- *the success of each town in balancing needs.*

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

- Credit for relevantly applied background: e.g. Pompeii was a Greek city of long-standing, absorbed into Rome in about 80 BC as an important port and producer of local goods; a relatively wealthy town it began to see some population growth in the early empire but was destroyed by Vesuvius in 79 AD; Ostia was a longstanding town and naval base for the capital city; it became a vital link in the grain trade as the empire grew in the 1st C AD; further great growth took place in the 2nd C AD (long after Pompeii was destroyed) putting tremendous pressure for high-density housing (for workers rather than affluent merchants); credit for linking these points with the quite different developments in housing in the two towns
- the *domus* was the standard housing unit in Pompeii & Ostia as elsewhere during the early empire; in **Pompeii** pressure on space was not sufficient to displace the *domus*: credit for example of early basic *domus*: e.g House of Sallust: an atrium house from 3rd C BC; then for development of peristyle house e.g. House of the Faun which was still going strong in 79 AD, showing relatively limited effect of population growth in Pompeii; some evidence of pressure on space from e.g. House of the Menander, initially atrium, then peristyle house; changed into 'block' over time, incorporating houses for poor (including workshops), shops and possibly a brothel; in 1st C AD Pompeii shows increase in numbers of *domus* filling gaps, resulting in irregular planning, with new shapes & sizes; also separate shops set into frontages; little evidence at **Ostia** before end of 1st C AD but such as there is suggests similar situation to Pompeii
- **Pompeii** never lived beyond this phase; great growth in **Ostia** from 1st C AD however demanded new solutions: need for mass housing for associated workers/merchants; credit for detail of early *insulae (*arranged in rectangular blocks round inner courtyard for communal light/water supply); 3-5 storeys decreasing in height & substance on higher floors; primarily living accommodation but many businesses on ground floor; fire precautions made wood rare (but necessary for weight reasons on higher storeys); concrete construction with bare brick finish (occasional decoration via balconies), so no great sophistication **but** housed many people in relatively small area e.g. House of Diana; internally simple & often uniform: mix of classes from rich to poor (decreasing status from bottom up); each flat with living & bedrooms plus kitchen; shared latrines (e.g. Cassette-tipo); less separation of rich & poor; other forms of high-rise building: two identical blocks (each divided by a corridor) with central garden (e.g. garden houses); six fountains in garden suggesting relative wealth & high expectations of inhabitants
- credit for giving details of individual houses where the details are relevant to the argument being produced.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.   *(30 marks)*

Option D

11 *How far does the development of the towns of Pompeii and Ostia reveal a similar approach to planning? What are the reasons for any differences?*

You might include discussion of
- *the range of buildings*
- *the development of the street-plans*
- *the provision of facilities*
- *the political, commercial, social and religious needs of each town.*

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

- neither town in the era we study was a 'green field' site; both were adaptations of existing, smaller (and in Pompeii's case non-Roman) towns; **Pompeii** was initially a small walled Greek settlement covering the SW section of the later Roman town; the street plan suggests the town spread systematically in a number of stages from this; the final stage would appear to be the area east of the main N-S street which has a regular grid plan apparently aligned to this road; by the 3rd C BC the town had reached its final size and new defensive walls were built; **Ostia** developed quite differently: from a small rectangular settlement around the later forum (very regular; split exactly by main N-S and W-E roads) irregular streets spread west and south; in about 80 BC a new set of walls was put round the enlarged town which now encompassed a major new development to the east of the original; on a regular plan this new area was declared public property
- basic facilities: city walls round both as mentioned above; **Pompeii** had seven gates, five leading to other towns (trade and travel), the Sea Gate to the port etc. **Ostia** had only three gates, reflecting its situation as the port of Rome rather than a regional crossroads like Pompeii; water was originally drawn from wells or the River Sarno for **Pompeii;** then in about 80 BC as part of its Romanisation an aqueduct was built from Avella; many wells used in **Ostia** as the water table was only just below ground level; an aqueduct was provided in the first half of the 1st C AD; both towns had similar systems of storage tanks with pipes to street fountains and the wealthiest private houses; **Pompeii**, with many wealthy families, had tombs lining the main roads out of the city; **Ostia** had a big public cemetery
- full range of public buildings in both towns reflecting political, social & religious practices; the original forum or business centre of each town was situated off-centre (according to original city plan), rather than in the middle of the new town; buildings of political significance tended to remain around the forum (e.g. *curia* at both, *comitium* at Pompeii); ditto commerce (e.g. both basilicas); temples were found around fora but also at other key points throughout the towns – four together by the new theatre area in **Ostia;** mainly though in original SW area of **Pompeii;** credit for examples (representing different eras, e.g. imperial ambitions) and for stressing the interconnection of religion, commerce and government in both towns
- social buildings spread out at **Pompeii:** three sets of baths all in western half of town; two theatres side by side in (Greek) SW of town; arena on far eastern side away from most other amenities; no amphitheatre has been found at **Ostia** while the only theatre is at the centre of the 1st C AD development, forming almost a new focal point away from the forum; 18 public baths have been found at Ostia, reflecting the late growth in population (and hygiene awareness, or just leisure / pleasure?)

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	4	0	4
02	1	0	1
03	5	5	10
04	8	12	20
TOTAL	**18**	**17**	**35**

Or
Option B

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
05	1	0	1
06	1	0	1
07	3	0	3
08	5	5	10
09	8	12	20
TOTAL	**18**	**17**	**35**

Section Two

Either
Option C

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
10	12	18	30
TOTAL	**12**	**18**	**30**

Or
Option D

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
11	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