



**General Certificate of Education
June 2013**

Classical Civilisation 1021

Roman Architecture and Town Planning

AS Unit 2E

Final

Mark Scheme

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

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

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

Copyright © 2013 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

DESCRIPTIONS OF LEVELS OF RESPONSE

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

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

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

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

QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

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

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

LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 10 MARKS

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

LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 20 MARKS

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

LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR QUESTIONS WORTH 30 MARKS

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

This page has been left intentionally blank

Mark Scheme
Unit 2E Roman Architecture and Town Planning

Section 1

Option A

01 What was the original source of water for the Stabian Baths?

A (deep) well (on the site) (1)

(1 mark)

02 Identify the areas marked A, B, C and D on the plan.

A = sports/exercise area (*palaestra*) (1); B = hot room (*caldarium*) (1); C = swimming bath (*natatio*) (1); D = shops (*tabernae*) (1)

(4 marks)

03 How well did the Stabian Baths suit the needs of the inhabitants of Pompeii?

Discussion might include: well-positioned (east of forum but central at junction of main N-S and W-E roads); available (in basic form) from 4thC BC (1st significant public bath facilities in Pompeii), but greatly enhanced in late 2ndC BC building programme and again 100 years later when Pompeii's aqueduct was built; central *palaestra* allowed space for exercise, sport etc.; portico on three sides featuring columns of simple tufa (later decorated with stucco) & affording shade; men's (larger) bath suite to east, women's (smaller) to north; despite early construction, full range of rooms provided; also supporting facilities (e.g. latrines, basic & individual; shops etc.); credit for (brief and appropriate) descriptions of rooms: **men's baths**: *apodyterium* linked directly to *tepidarium* (warm room) to allow acclimatisation; *caldarium* (hot room) next door to furnace was a large apsed hall, with a tank for hot bathing & a fountain to cleanse hands (wonderful Flavian period stucco decoration on walls & vaulting); all rooms mentioned so far had barrel-vaulted ceilings; *frigidarium* (cold room) accessed direct from changing room had very early concrete dome; circular tank for bathing here; *natatio* (swimming pool) added in late 1st C AD; **women's baths** smaller and more limited range (but at least they were provided); basically all remained in this form until the destruction of 79 AD.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(10 marks)

04 'The Baths of Caracalla were as much a political monument as a bathing complex.'

How far do you agree? Give reasons for your answer.

You might include discussion of:

- reasons why the Baths of Caracalla were built
- the scale of the project
- materials and techniques of construction used
- external and internal decoration
- facilities provided.

Points suggesting it was a political monument might include:

- *reasons for building*: built new 211-216 AD by Caracalla as statement of imperial power and to cement his position with the people (free access to the facilities for all); one of a series of bath complexes built by various emperors as a display of Rome's (and their own personal) authority

- *scale*: (based on plans from time of Septimius Severus) huge platform covering 100,000 sq metres; building itself featuring a massive main hall with four entrances, cross-vaulted in three bays, with huge piers to support; must have been as much to impress as to service needs of public: **the bath complex itself**: tremendous size of the complex (approx 225 x 185 metres x 35 metres high) would create awe; the imposing central block with *natatio*, *frigidarium* and circular *caldarium* aligned on central axis; elegant balance of surrounding structures (added by 235 AD)
- *construction and materials*: huge job taking 9,000 workmen more than five years to complete; required flattening existing buildings, removal of 150,000 cm of earth; provision of earth, stone and mortar for foundations; creation of substructures, starting with 330,000 cm of landfill; then bringing in of 280,000 cm of tufa and mortar & 15 million pieces of brick; use of cranes to raise walls and vaults of concrete (210,000 cm), brick (5.6 million pieces plus 815,000 whole bricks); creation of ornate columns not structurally necessary but making architectural statement; baths themselves made of granite, basalt and alabaster; was this 'cost-effective' in any terms other than self-aggrandisement? Ditto regarding provision of water (credit for details of 8.2 million litre capacity water cisterns and construction of new aqueduct)
- *decoration*: new street (*Via Nova*) created parallel to the *Via Appia* allowing full effect of Baths to be appreciated; use of marble and granite (e.g. 252 full column shafts weighing c 90 tons each); credit for details re sourcing of materials; décor in main rooms was mix of statuary, exotic marble facing and mosaic work; interior of baths was focal point of style but exterior not neglected; multi-tiered ranks of columns and niches to recall theatre frontages; clear primary aim was to impress
- *range of facilities*: **baths**: 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; **other facilities**: attempt to provide full range of public leisure facilities (public libraries, shops, gardens, walks, fountains etc.); clearly must be seen in context of series of imperial building schemes over 200 years, each trying to emphasise grandeur of current dynasty by provision of more imposing facilities than predecessors; massive range compared to Pompeii and Ostia.

Points suggesting it was important as a set of baths might include:

- *reasons for building*: population growth in Rome led to problems with hygiene, water supply, public recreation space etc.; these baths were planned to alleviate these problems
- *scale*: such a vital amenity with such a large population to serve required a building on a massive scale; this was as much a functional necessity as an attempt to show off political power (credit for using detail from above to support this line of argument)
- *construction and materials*: excellence of these ensured a great experience for the bathers and other visitors; health & safety bound up with practicality and beauty (safe flooring, sturdy construction, enough room to avoid crushes etc.); (credit for using detail from above to support this line of argument)
- *decoration*: ditto: a degree of splendour that most of the users could never have dreamt of seeing; spiritually uplifting as well as practical; (credit for using detail from above to support this line of argument)
- *range of facilities*: despite obvious desire to impress, these facilities were a real boon to the population: libraries for study, meeting places, fresh air and open spaces within the city, water for general use and of course a fantastic baths complex (credit for using detail from above to support this line of argument; also for **brief** account of functions of individual rooms/areas).

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(20 marks)

Option B**05 At about what date was the Capitulum at Pompeii first built?**

Mid second century BC (allow range from 175-125 BC) (1)

(1 mark)

06 To which three deities was the Capitulum dedicated?

Jupiter or King of the gods(1) / Juno or Queen of the gods (1) / Minerva or goddess of wisdom/crafts (1)

(3 marks)

07 To which order of architecture did the columns shown in the photograph belong?

Corinthian (allow Ionic) (1)

(1 mark)

08 How imposing were the appearance of the Capitulum at Pompeii and its position in the forum?

Discussion might include: *temple itself*: provided focal point at north extremity of forum, closing the forum off to the north; temple on this site since early years, but converted with full rebuild c 80 BC as part of new Italic forum; visual marker of award of ‘Roman citizen colony’ status; set on high podium reached by double flight of steps to dominate main forum of ‘new’ town and to remind Pompeians of the power of Rome; it was also the city treasury (so provided religious, commercial and political facets to the forum); large and imposing (37 x 17m and 3m high); *hexastyle* design but *tetrastyle pronaos* (4 x 7 fluted columns); deep Corinthian *pronaos* in front of triple *cella* to contain 3 standard deities; back wall veneered in marble (credit for further details); *place in forum design*: well positioned for commercial role (credit for references to commercial buildings down east side of forum – e.g. macellum, Eumachia building etc.); also dominant religious position (credit for comparison with other temples – e.g. T of Apollo outside and to west of forum, imperial cult buildings between commercial buildings down east side etc.); position opposite political buildings grouped at southern end of forum (marking separating of religion & politics?); credit for any reasonable points about the suitability of the layout, but focus must be on Capitulum.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(10 marks)

09 ‘Temples outside Rome all looked the same as each other.’

How far do you agree? Give reasons for your answer and refer to specific examples of temples from outside Rome.

You might include discussion of:

- the Temple of Apollo at Pompeii and temples at Cosa, Ostia and Nimes
- their dates
- their position and layout
- their external and internal appearance
- materials and techniques of construction used.

Comparative points to consider in judging similarity or difference might include some but not necessarily all of the following:

- *date: **Apollo Pompeii***: east-facing temple of 5th C BC but modified 2nd C BC, century earlier than Capitulum Pompeii. ***Capitulum Cosa***: from 2nd C BC so again earlier example. ***Capitulum Ostia***: from first half of 2nd C BC; another earlier example. ***Maison Carrée***: late 1st C BC so at least half a century later than the others studied
- *position: **Apollo Pompeii*** situated alongside but outside forum so less of a focal point; within its own precinct (48 columns) on high podium with steps up, so imposing within own setting ***Capitulum Cosa***: good site on levelled ground but above city, rather than in forum (different way to demonstrate Roman pre-eminence over locals, here Tuscans); again stone steps up to high (3.7 m) podium, surrounded by stone wall. ***Capitulum Ostia***: similar situation to Pompeian Capitulum at northern end of main forum; similar grand set of steps up to porch. ***Maison Carrée***: built in Augustan formal style (featuring return to Greek influence); north-facing and set in courtyard within forum (like Capitulum at Pompeii) on 2.85m high podium (basic dominance of position like Capitulum Pompeii but diminished by lack of frontal emphasis from pseudoperipteral appearance)
- *layout/materials/construction/external appearance: **Apollo Pompeii***: building peripteral with single cella (situated further back than Capitulum Pompeii (likely to have been very dark inside); surrounded by Ionic (later Corinthian) colonnade of tufa and fronted by six Corinthian columns; signs of romanisation at similar time to Capitulum Pompeii (e.g. capitals and details of entablature received fine stucco re-covering); superstructure featured Doric architrave of metopes & triglyphs (clearly pre-Roman) later replaced by continuous frieze with griffins, festoons & foliage; altar on travertine base to front, statues of Apollo & Diana in forecourt; this temple may be here focus of its precinct, but *not* of the forum. ***Capitulum Cosa***: 4 widely-spaced Tuscan columns fronted porch, back half of which was enclosed (allowing entrants to experience gradual move from light to darkness); triple cella inside at back; shallow ridge roof hung over entablature & porch as well as sides; back & side walls of temple blank; materials basically brick, but superstructure of wood; decorations of terracotta ('rich & sophisticated') but only at front (no frieze all round) inc pediment; despite being Capitulum like Capitulum Pompeii, possibly the least similar in terms of appearance & design (as well as situation). ***Capitulum Ostia***: again free-standing hexastyle with fluted white marble columns; basic materials including brick faced concrete; regular cella with traces of African marble remaining; superstructure basically gone but pieces of frieze & cornice remain (again, marble); 3 subterranean chambers beneath cella; usual altar to front (more African marble). ***Maison Carrée***: rectangular layout 26.42 x 13.54m; built of local limestone; great use of marble for pillars & facing; hexastyle arrangement with Corinthian columns, six at front, then 11 columns to side including half-columns (pseudoperipteral); half-columns continue round back (20 in all) and stand out by being slightly more than half-columns; architrave divided by recessed rows of petrified water drips; egg & dart decoration divides architrave from frieze which goes all the way round; fine ornamental carvings of rosettes & acanthus leaves, beneath dentils.
- *other*: credit also for relevant reference to any/all of following: **C. Cosa** and **C. Ostia** were main temples of their cities in honour of the triad (king & queen of gods & goddess of wisdom) possibly brought across from Etruscan tradition; **C. Ostia** is believed to have housed city treasury & archives; **C. Cosa** has no known secondary function. ***Apollo Pompeii***: dedicated to Apollo in line with Greek origins of city; later restored by Augustus as Apollo was a favourite of his; had the town's official weights & measures data stored nearby, but no direct link. ***Maison Carrée***: dedicated to Gaius & Lucius Caesar (sons of Augustus), so different in that sense from 3 Capitolia & Temple of Apollo, all attached to specific deities; suggests political as much as religious function in building this temple.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(20 marks)

Section 2

Option C

- 10 **How effective were the theatres and amphitheatres you have studied both in providing entertainment and in demonstrating the political power of the people who commissioned them?**

Give reasons for your answer and refer to at least two theatres and two amphitheatres.

You might include discussion of:

- **who commissioned each example, when and why**
- **position and size of each**
- **materials used and attention to external and internal appearance**
- **comfort, safety and facilities provided.**

Points suggesting they were more for entertainment might include:

- **commissioning: Pompeii:** the Large Theatre was provided by the Greeks for the small colony in the 2nd C BC presumably as a place of entertainment; the population increase when the city became a Roman colony demanded a set of standard Roman entertainment buildings; the converted Large Theatre and new Small Theatre and Amphitheatre were thus provided for entertainment; none of the 3 was particularly elaborate. **Ostia:** lack of amphitheatre suggests proximity to Rome gave ample opportunity to visit places of entertainment there; with the 1st C AD growth it justified a theatre of its own and so one was built with no great outward appearance but integrated into the new commercial centre; no amphitheatre was built, presumably because Rome could still supply this. **Rome:** had long made do with temporary wooden theatres which were inadequate after massive population growth of late 1st C BC/early 1st C AD period; one great theatre and one great amphitheatre allowed most of the population to enjoy top entertainment for the first time
- **position/size: Pompeii:** Large Theatre in unimposing position by the original Greek forum and built into the hillside; capacity about 3,000, enough to hold most of early population for festivals of drama etc; Roman rebuilding only added about 2000 to capacity: no 'grand political design'; Small Theatre had capacity of only about 1,000; attractively designed but hidden out of the way; both theatres positioned to be functional rather than to make political points; Amphitheatre well away from the heart of the city, allowing mass entertainment to be held without interfering with other life of the city (population estimated at 20,000 by 79 AD). **Ostia:** Theatre integral part of new town centre; not separated out to impress but entrances dual-purpose allowing access to shops etc; capacity less than 4,000 despite population being larger than Pompeii's; suggests no great attempt to impress with size; again, functional rather than built to make any point. **Rome:** early theatres mainly small & temporary; only major venue was Theatre of Pompey; increase in population demanded a bigger central theatre; Theatre of Marcellus fulfilled this offering large distinctive building to house about 20,000 in fine setting between Capitol hill & River Tiber; Colosseum followed as even bigger entertainment venue required; again its situation (even more central than T of M) was as much to do with access as propaganda value; capacity of about 80,000 simply reflects the needs of a city with 1 million inhabitants

- materials/appearance*: **Pompeii**: Large Theatre built into hillside; local stone used with little external decoration (no frontage); Small Theatre hard to see from outside as hidden away behind Large Theatre; Amphitheatre: set into ground so little grandeur through height; despite (mainly blind) arches, use of plain local stone and unembellished appearance rendered more functional than seeking admiration; basically a simple arena for entertainment. **Ostia**: Theatre built from best materials (see above) but for customer comfort as much as to show off; hence appearance of exterior was functional (arches to allow shops), blending in with new square. **Rome**: fabulous design & materials (see above), but all to a purpose; exterior design of both Marcellus & Colosseum primarily to enable easy access and provide facilities for audience (see below)
- comfort/safety/facilities*: **Pompeii**: Large Theatre: extra safety provided by adding top tier access from old forum to access points in lower tiers (from either side of *orchestra* with five ascending rows of stairs); cover against weather provided by awnings on temporary basis as needed; generally safe given reasonably small capacity; Small Theatre; capacity allowing only 1000 to attend suggests facilities only aimed at small minority (presumably the rich & powerful); building aimed at getting them on board (and getting sponsor re-elected). **Ostia**: Theatre: two easy ground floor access points plus steps to higher level after rebuilding; all assured safety; credit for reference to nearby shops etc. **Rome**: Theatre of Marcellus: freestanding nature allowed large number of arched entrances to ease access and ensure social segregation (as Colosseum later); Colosseum: access via large number of numbered arched entrances on the lower floor; made access (and escape) speedy, safe and comfortable; wide circulation passages within led to the lower seats and wide staircases to the higher levels; top level (reserved for the poorest spectators) partly of wood; very best seats at bottom (with separate access); awning kept the direct sun off spectators; cleverly designed substructure with cells, rooms and a lift system helped ensure all went smoothly. Full range of shops, toilet facilities etc. at both venues; credit for specific examples. **All these more likely to be seen as ‘mainly for entertainment’ but equal credit for sensible reference to links with political power.**

Points suggesting political motivation might include some but not necessarily all of:

- commissioning*: **Pompeii**: Large Theatre pre-Roman (from first half of 2nd C BC), but rebuilt in Roman style when the township became Roman colony in 80 BC; at the same time the Small Theatre & Amphitheatre were provided; suggests a clear political desire to make the city Roman; local chiefs sponsored these (e.g. the duovirs Valgus & Porcius paying for Small Theatre & Amphitheatre) presumably to gain political influence by pleasing the people. **Ostia**: long history of link with Rome (first Roman colony in late 3rd 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; hence provision looks like example of Augustan propaganda (followed up by improvements under Septimius Severus/Caracalla). **Rome**: had many temporary wooden arenas but no permanent theatre until Pompey’s in 61 BC; Julius Caesar’s rivalry demanded bigger, better theatre; Theatre of Marcellus started about 11 BC as part of Augustus’ renewal of Rome; then following accession of Flavians, Vespasian started the Colosseum to ‘better’ the Julians’ theatre; Titus completed it in honour of his father
- position/size*: **Pompeii**: Large Theatre: not initially a majestic-looking building and situated away from main forum but heavy alterations in early Roman period (adding third tier to bring capacity to about 5,000; provision of new access at top; removal of the gathering piazza outside to provide gladiator barracks in support of new Amphitheatre) all very deliberate to emphasise that the city was now Roman; Small Theatre despite low capacity had very attractive design and backed up political effect caused by changes to Large Theatre; Amphitheatre, deliberately placed on far (eastern) side of the city, provided new focus among the buildings of the new Roman town which grew around it. **Ostia**: Theatre part of new commercial centre alongside Street of the Corporations; freestanding (unlike Pompeii Large Theatre) in Roman rather than Greek

idiom; again whole development a statement reflecting values of Augustan era; increased capacity (from 4,000 to 6,000) during later period suggests theatre as status symbol rather than place for mass entertainment. **Rome:** Theatre of Marcellus: part of rebuilding programme to consolidate position of Augustus, so built as three-tiered freestanding structure in prime position between Capitol hill & Tiber; capacity 20,500 as befitted capital city (much bigger than any previous theatre); opened at almost exactly same time as Ostia (13-11 BC), suggesting similar propaganda intentions; Colosseum: clear inspiration from Theatre of Marcellus but increase of scale indicates new dynasty trying to top previous one; fine central site dominating Forum; capacity 80,000 (one of biggest ever - 188 x 156 metres in size; 48 metres high); clearly designed to hold (and impress) visitors as much as locals

- *materials/appearance:* **Pompeii:** Large Theatre: enlargement of 1st C BC using marble to impress (paid for by local merchants); Small Theatre: impressive by its very existence (magistrates seeking to influence rich minority who could be fitted in?); all-over roof unusually extravagant. Amphitheatre: first known arena fully made of masonry so would have impressed locals; arches with outside staircases gave some sense of style (sponsoring magistrates seeking to impress). **Ostia:** designed with new opportunities created by concrete, then full use of marble to adorn the basic tufa; appearance fundamentally linked to buildings around it (arcades contained shops). **Rome:** both Theatre of Marcellus & Colosseum paid full attention to appearance; both freestanding and each dominating a key area of central Rome; Marcellus: elaborate substructures providing good support with reticulate-faced concrete with concrete barrel-vaults; these formed the outer corridor and effectively acted as buttresses; all then faced with marble; Colosseum: supported by huge elliptical ring of concrete topped with blocks of travertine; supporting piers rise from here; outer wall built to impress (four storeys, Doric, Ionic & Corinthian plus plain top floor); 80 arches flanked by engaged columns on each of the lower floors; all faced in marble and with statues in each archway; imperial extravagance with Colosseum outdoing Theatre of Marcellus
- *comfort/safety/facilities:* See above.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(30 marks)

Option D

- 11 ***‘Despite the very different natures of Pompeii and Ostia, the development of their town plans and the range of public buildings were very similar.’***

To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Give reasons for your answer and refer to specific similarities and differences between the two.

You might include discussion of:

- ***each town’s historical background***
- ***the development of street plans***
- ***how commercial, political and religious needs were met***
- ***how population growth was managed***
- ***water supply***
- ***provision of leisure facilities.***

Points suggesting similarities in town planning might include some but not necessarily all of:

- *development*: both towns had a long history of development running up to the era we study; Pompeii was originally a small Greek settlement, a fair distance from Rome and her influence while Ostia was a Roman military base, key to the defence and trading ability of the capital; both spread to accommodate growing populations (although for different reasons); the town plan of both reveals a mix of formal planning and periods of less orderly development
- *street plans*: each had a two-phase development during the early years BC: Pompeii initially spread NE from the early Greek settlement while Ostia spread S & W from its small rectangular schools and colleges; both were surrounded by defensive walls featuring city gates (Pompeii 7, Ostia 3) as they grew in importance; both then had enjoyed a further major development to the East as population suddenly increased
- *commercial/political/religious*: both towns were originally based geographically around a formal forum (in Pompeii's case replacing an earlier Greek forum); these central fora were rendered off-schools and colleges in both cases by the later eastward developments, but continued to house key political and religious buildings (e.g. capitolium, basilica & curia in each)
- *population growth*: both cities had to cope with population growth, Pompeii earlier than Ostia and more gradual; both had to devise ways of using space available to best effect & did so successfully even in different ways (*domus* expansion in Pompeii, development of *insulae* in Ostia)
- *water supply*: both originally drew water from wells or local rivers (e.g. Sarno for Pompeii); both were provided with aqueducts (Pompeii from Avella in about 80 BC as part of its romanisation, Ostia 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;
- *leisure facilities*: both cities received most of the 'standard' leisure facilities found in any major town: baths, theatres, inns, food shops are found at both (credit for specific examples and brief analyses of what they contributed to each town)

Points suggesting differences might include:

- *development*: their historical backgrounds left very different marks on each town; Pompeii's Greek background meant that the typically Roman grid-plan came late after a period of less regimented growth; Ostia's final development shows many traces of its military origins; Ostia went on developing well into the 3rd C AD, Pompeii's development was cut off dramatically in 79 AD; (credit for reference to geographical differences, such as terrain)
- *street plans*: Pompeii's early plan was a fairly irregular one showing its Greek origins; the street plan suggests the town then spread more systematically in a number of stages from this; the final stage encompassed the area east of the main N-S street; this was developed on a typical regular Roman grid plan aligned to this road; by the 3rd C BC the town had reached its final size and its defensive walls were built; Ostia was quite different: regular at first (the small rectangular settlement around the later forum was split exactly by the main N-S and W-E roads), the initial period of growth involved streets spreading west and south in irregular fashion; later (about 80 BC) the walls were built, enclosing not only the original town and extended town, but also a major new development to the east of the original schools and colleges
- *commercial/political/religious*: while Pompeii's forum remained the focal point of the town for commercial & religious practices (there were few major public buildings of this kind in the new eastern areas of the city), Ostia's forum was very much sidelined from a commercial point of view by the new Square of the Corporations in the new part of that city (credit for contrasting this with continuing commercial premises in the Pompeii forum - e.g. macellum or Eumachia building)

- *population growth*: Pompeii had gradual growth in population in the century following Sulla's colonization of 81 BC; continued development of *domus* (credit for examples showing changing nature of, e.g. Houses of Sallust/Menander); destruction of 79 AD froze housing development in Pompeii; contrast with Ostia; from about 79, need to accommodate workers for port activities/corn supply; introduction of *insulae* (credit for examples showing different categories e.g. cassette-tipo, Garden Houses etc.); later drop in population with return to *domus* but Pompeii long gone by now
- *water supply*: Pompeii as a wealthy town received an aqueduct much earlier than Ostia; only when the port development took place did Ostia receive one, after Pompeii was destroyed; Ostia on the other hand seems to have had a more 'modern' sewage system with many private toilets; much sewage at Pompeii went down the streets; both cities were well stocked with public baths and street fountains; some wealthy private houses in both had private water supplies (credit for specific examples of baths etc.; also for **brief** justification of what went on there)
- *leisure facilities*: while there were public leisure buildings in both towns, Pompeii had two theatres from early days, Ostia only received her theatre as part of 1st C AD improvements; Pompeii had a large amphitheatre on far eastern side away from most other amenities; it seems that Ostia did not have one; credit for reference to Ostia's proximity to Rome in explaining this difference; again leisure development at Pompeii tended to be in western (original) part of town (three sets of baths) where the theatres had always been; 18 public baths have been found throughout Ostia, reflecting the late growth in population (and hygiene awareness); in Ostia the theatre was in the new eastern (commercial) part of city.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme.

(30 marks)

Assessment Objectives Grid
Unit 2E Roman Architecture and Town Planning

Section 1

Either
Option A

| | AO1 | AO2 | TOTAL |
|--------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| 01 | 1 | - | 1 |
| 02 | 4 | - | 4 |
| 03 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| 04 | 8 | 12 | 20 |
| TOTAL | 18 | 17 | 35 |

Or
Option B

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

Section 2

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% |