AQA

AS-LEVEL
Classical Civilisation

CIV2E Roman Architecture and Town Planning
Mark scheme

2020
June 2015

Version 1: Final mark scheme

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

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

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

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**

This page has been left intentionally blank

Unit 2E Roman Architecture and Town Planning

Section 1

Option A

01 Name the buildings marked A and B on the plan.

A = Basilica (1) **B** = Amphitheatre (1)

[2 marks]

02 The area marked C is the forum. Give three features of its appearance in its final form.

Three from: Capitolium at N end (1) / open area in centre (1) / with statues (1) / newsboards (1) / paving stones (1) / colonnades (1) / arches (1) etc.

[3 marks]

03 How convenient do you think the positions of the public buildings and areas of Pompeii were?

Discussion might include:
Irregular shape of SW quarter of plan indicates probable site of original settlement (7th or 6th Century BC): hence forum and its main buildings are in the western side of the town rather than the centre; ditto the theatres which would have been fairly central initially, but ended up rather tucked away in the SW corner as the town grew; forum contains many of key buildings from the early Roman period (including main temples and forum baths); as Pompeii expanded (initially by addition of the NW quarter by Greeks in 5th Century BC; then in the 300 years before Rome took over by the Samnites) the city extended to the site of final walls, with main N-S and E-W roads appearing; Stabian Baths which had been to east of Centre were now truly central, while new Central Baths were added nearby just before the destruction of the city; all these were reasonably convenient for the majority of the citizens, while the amphitheatre provided (like many of the key public buildings) during the Sulla period (c 80 BC) was well away from the other public buildings to the far SE of the plan; credit for discussing whether this made it inconvenient (a long walk for many) or convenient (out of the way to cause least disruption – rather like most modern football stadia); credit for extending any of these basic geographical points to discuss other changes over time which affected the convenience of the public – eg adaptation of temples for commercial purposes, changes around the forum over time etc.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme. **[10 marks]**

04 'The Temple of Apollo and the Capitolium in Pompeii were entirely traditional whereas the Pantheon in Rome was not traditional in any way.'

To what extent do you agree? Give reasons for your answer and refer to all three temples.

You might include discussion of:

- **when and why each temple was built**
- **their materials and construction techniques**
- **the ground plan, outward appearance and decoration of each**
- **the interior appearance and decoration of each.**

Discussion might include:

- **when / why:**
  Apollo: in its own precinct beside (rather than in) the main forum; very early temple, originally pre-Roman (5th Century BC); much modified by Romans in 2nd Century BC; originally in honour of Greek Apollo, but retained by Romans, although Capitolium to some extent pushed it into background?; outer wall (backing onto forum) contained city's weights and measures office; **Capitolium**: formed focal point of forum, positioned in centre of north side; early temple (Temple of Jupiter of c 150 BC) on same site but much rebuilt c 80 BC as part of Romanisation; worship here of the Capitoline triad (Jupiter, Juno, Minerva) also fulfilled commercial role as part of the temple contained city treasury; **Pantheon**: built in the Campus Martius, away from the main centre of Rome, originally as part of Augustus' rebuilding programme; two fires (80 and 110 BC) virtually destroyed it, so totally new temple built under Hadrian (118-128 AD); appears to have been temple to all gods and to have been an attempt by Hadrian to outdo his predecessors in style, construction and wealth of materials
- **shape / appearance / plan:**
  Apollo: peripteral style with enclosed single cella to rear; temple itself surrounded by colonnade of (9 x 17) Ionic columns and set on high podium approached by steps to the front; six frontal columns were (latterly) Corinthian with 9 rather than the more regular 13 side columns (fluted after rebuilding); it dominated its precinct but was rather hidden from main forum; **Capitolium**: many similarities to Apollo, although larger (37 x 17 metres) and higher (3 metres): set on podium (of 'opus incertum') with, this time, double set of steps; similar frontal axis, but no precinct (forum in a sense was its precinct); height made it dominate the forum area; hexastyle frontage leading to tetrastyle pronaos with 4 x 7 fluted Corinthian columns; cella at rear; **Pantheon**: original temple was probably standard rectangular design, but Hadrian's rebuilding was revolutionary; from front it was clearly huge but otherwise appeared to be nothing unusual (standard rectangular shape, not raised up, unlike Pompeian temples); frontage of 8 giant Corinthian columns (plus 2 at sides) with architrave incorporated inscription from original temple of 27 BC; unlike Pompeian temples however it was the inside that was revolutionary: porch opened into circular interior not anticipated from outside (see below)
- **materials / construction:**
  Apollo: despite rebuilding, essentially remained a simple building of post and lintel construction using local stone and tufa pillars; a travertine altar stood at the bottom of the steps; the original Doric entablature was replaced in the 80 BC reconstruction by a continuous plaster frieze depicting 'griffins, festoons and foliage'; at the same time the Ionic capitals were replaced by Corinthian (all now disappeared); floor of cella was of coloured diamond-shaped stones; **Capitolium**: more elaborate version of Apollo, still based on post and lintel technique but all on bigger scale; use of stucco and travertine as facing materials but essentially of local stone; cella floor decoration was similar to Apollo;

Pantheon: standard post and lintel construction of entrance (with 50 foot granite columns) led to porch of 3 corridors divided by 8 inner columns; this led to the rotunda with dome (incorporating oculus – the only source of light); tufa, brick and concrete (key new material) were basic materials; the dome (43.2 metres) was made entirely of concrete, its 5000 ton weight supported by 8 barrel vaults; rich marble and other wealthy materials were used for facing throughout

- **interiors:**
  Apollo: cella would have been small and dark (statue of god was in precinct rather than cella); interior was for priests and initiates; mass worship took place outside (presumably around altar); **Capitolium**: similar arrangement to Apollo, but with bigger and deeper cella to hold the three deities (head of Jupiter survives but not on site); again this was a single room and no need for rich decoration (though walls originally painted to resemble marble – later replaced with frescoes) as only normally entered by priests / officials; **Pantheon** (see above): emphasis on interior so totally different type of temple from Pompeian examples; dome rose above coffered ceiling of light pumice (lead lined); oculus allowed light to shine down to checkerboard-patterned floor.

(credit for use of a range of the material above to compare and contrast the Pompeian temples with the Pantheon in line with the quotation in the question)

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme. **[20 marks]**

Option B

05 In this theatre what differences were there between the entrance for wealthy citizens and the entrances for the lower classes? Give three details.

Three from: **wealthy** by (central) corridor (1) / between shops (1) / at ground level (1); **lower classes** by (any of) four (1) / staircases (1) / to upper storeys (1) - must include at least one from each category.

[3 marks]

06 Give two features of the Piazzale delle Corporazioni, which was next to the theatre.

Two from: offices (1) / for guilds (1) / (mainly) connected with grain supply (1) / and shipping (1) / (featuring fine) mosaics (1) / temple (in middle) (1) / surrounded by colonnade (1)

[2 marks]

07 How well did the Theatre at Ostia and the Piazzale delle Corporazioni suit the needs of the people of Ostia?

Discussion might include:
In the late 1st Century BC Ostia was an (increasingly) big town with a range of housing, shops etc but no known place for mass entertainment so clearly fulfilled a basic need; the relatively late date (around the turn from BC to AD) under Augustus allowed it both to be incorporated into a new business area and to learn from developments in architecture (so freestanding) bringing style and utility; initially the capacity was about 3000 so modest (population at height reckoned to have been 50 000); could not be used to house major part of population (and no amphitheatre for mass entertainment), but well positioned for 'new town centre', sharing site with new shops, guilds, etc; **appearance / materials, etc**.: theatre functional rather than aesthetically dramatic, but built from best new materials: tufa for basic structure (brick after rebuilding) but much concrete for arches etc. and marble facing; integrated stylistically into buildings around; freestanding with arches as support, allowing circulation in passages all round, so latest thing in health and safety; initially had large corridor entrance (plus entrances at both sides) – safe enough for small capacity? - but after rebuilding (by Commodus and / or Septimius Severus between 176 and 196 AD), capacity was increased (to about 5000) and upper entrances were added; main entrance nicely decorated (marble – also used to face the seats); in final form rose to three levels, each featuring arches; 3rd level adorned with marble columns (still visible but now on stage); whole seating area had awning which could be unfurled to protect from sun / rain; all in all nice mix of functionality, smartness and comfort; **entertainment**: would be standard fare – Greek style tragedy and comedy, mime, etc small size suggests possibility of group meetings, election speeches, etc but no likelihood that the bloodier mass entertainment seen in amphitheatres would have transferred here (did the locals go to Rome for the nastier stuff?); the Piazzale provided a mix of leisure and business, replacing to a degree the forum as the main sense of commerce; aesthetically the joint design of theatre / businesss centre was pleasing; practically, guilds, traders and shippers had a centre for their operation with space to meet clients, good advertising (mosaics), and small rooms thought to have been offices; credit for using any of the above (and other detail) to look at (preferably both sides of) the question.

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme. **[10 marks]**

08 How successfully do you think the Large and Small Theatres at Pompeii and the Theatre of Marcellus in Rome met the needs both of their sponsors and of the inhabitants of each city? Give reasons for your answer.

You might include discussion of:

- **when and why each theatre was built**
- **size and position**
- **design and layout**
- **materials and construction techniques**
- **decoration**
- **comfort and safety.**

Discussion might include:

- **when / why:**
  earliest theatre was **Large Theatre Pompeii**, from c 160 BC; built in Greek style before Pompeii became Roman city; served as main entertainment venue for city until after Sulla's invasion (80 BC) when 2nd theatre (below) and amphitheatre were added; at about same time Large Theatre was Romanised – 3rd tier added and detail alterations to make less Greek; political involvement here – changes paid for by Holconius brothers; **Small Theatre Pompeii** was second oldest (c 80 BC); extended recreational facilities under new Roman government, built by two duovirs, Valgus and Porcius; most likely political motive (electioneering? – also to show people they were now Roman); **Theatre of Marcellus** was built in about 11 BC by Augustus in honour of his dead nephew; also to increase facilities in city with few theatres (main rival Theatre of Pompey from 60s BC); also clear political statement (part of Augustus' propaganda programme to cement his imperial family)
  size / position:
  Theatre of Marcellus is largest of the three; positioned just away from the main forum area but between Capitol and Tiber, well in touch with city centre; capacity of 11 500-20 000 was much bigger than other theatres and its freestanding construction made it an appropriately visual building (below); **Large Theatre Pompeii** very similar in capacity to Ostia (despite Pompeii having much smaller population than Ostia); Large Theatre set in oldest part of Pompeii some way south of forum and main buildings (next to old Triangular Forum); initial capacity of about 3000 was increased during Romanisation to about 5000 (by addition of 3rd tier); **Small Theatre Pompeii** was far and away least typical in size; set next to Large Theatre (and rather overshadowed by it) it could hold only 1000
- **design / layout / construction / decoration:**
  Theatre of Marcellus was the most lavishly designed and built (because of Rome being capital – eyes of world on it – and project of the Emperor); freestanding nature with elaborate substructure keeping huge building secure; built mainly of tufa faced with concrete; concrete barrel-vaults formed outer corridor and served as buttresses; white travertine blocks with marble facing were used for the main structure; arch construction allowed for a series of entrances, tunnels and circulating corridors, with ramps leading to higher levels; there were three storeys, the lowest adorned with Doric columns, the second with Ionic and the upper (plainer and now missing) possibly with Corinthian columns; **Small Theatre Pompeii**, although small and hidden away, is seen as 'one of the most harmonious' in design; although built in 80 BC it has many of the features described as 'Roman' in later theatres; reducing size of upper seats, and oblong design pulling cavea, orchestra and stage together, allowed provision of a (rare) integral roof; seats were of masonry capped with tufa; entry only from lower seating area but no great

problem as low capacity(?); **Large Theatre Pompeii**, as oldest example does not show attention to external detail; built into hillside so lacked circulating areas, arches, etc of Marcellus and Ostia; local stone used in construction; piazza for gathering originally provided outside but removed during rebuilding (to use as gladiator barracks); more impressive after rebuilding as marble added (for seats and other features) but rather basic in comparison to later theatres

comfort / safety:

credit for looking at variety of access and the effect this had on these: initial access to **Large Theatre Pompeii** was basic, lacking room for circulation; access only to lower levels then need for poor to climb to top; very difficult to evacuate quickly; rebuilding added top entrances with some corridors; much safer; **Small Theatre Pompeii** never had (or needed, given small size?) entrances other than at ground level; despite size could have been dangerous if fire (and not helped by having a permanent roof?); bigger **Theatre of Marcellus** with many arched entrances, ramps, corridor even better thought out.

(credit for any brief and relevant discussion of similarities / differences in use**: Small Theatre Pompeii** would have limited range of activity (speeches, mime, etc); overall roof a boon to spectators; **Large Theatre Pompeii** had full range of plays, public meetings, etc; use of awnings at both to protect audience; provision of refreshments; **Theatre of Marcellus**: despite extra size probably similar range of entertainment)

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme. **[20 marks]**

Section 2

Option C

09 'The water supply in Pompeii was as reliable and safe as the water supply in Rome.'

To what extent do you agree? Give reasons for your answer and refer to specific examples from both cities.

You might include discussion of:

- **early forms of water supply in each city**
- **aqueducts**
- **storage and distribution of water within the cities**
- **uses of water**
- **problems encountered and each city's success in solving these.**

Discussion might include:

- **early supply:**
  water supply is clearly vital to any city; often it was a key factor in initial selection of city site: **Pompeii** was a coastal town with River Sarno adjacent; the initial small settlement relied on wells as well as collecting rainwater from roofs of houses and storing in underground cisterns; problems arose with growth of the city; **Rome**, on the River Tiber would have access to fresh water from the river; fine along with wells for the infant city but, again with growth, not so when population rose to over 1 million by time of empire
- **aqueducts:**
  as **Pompeii** grew, the need for constant supply of water became more pressing; the solution came after 80 BC with the Romanisation of the city: an aqueduct was constructed to bring clear water from Avella (hill town 40 km away); as further growth took place (mainly of new Roman settlers) a second aqueduct was required; Augustus provided this early in the 1st Century AD (the Aqua Augusta, shared with neighbouring towns); this started at Serino, 370 metres above sea level and was one of most complex aqueducts built (credit for detail even if generic); **Rome** was much quicker off the mark: as early as 312 BC the Aqua Appia was constructed (almost entirely underground) bringing 75 000 cm of water 17 kms into the city centre; a further 10 aqueducts followed; credit for relevant examples, eg from period of republic, Aqua Marcia (144 BC, 91 km); Aqua Julia (33 BC, 21 km); from early Empire, Aqua Claudia (52 AD, 87 km); all in all nearly 400 km of construction
- **storage / distribution:**
  it was important to store and distribute water from these new supplies within each city: **Pompeii** built a 'castellum aquae' (to hold the incoming water from Serino) near the Vesuvius Gate at height of 43 m above sea level; three exits (controlled by shutters) allowed pipes out to serve different areas of the city and a series of five smaller storage tanks; from here (lead) pipes served public fountains, baths and wealthy citizens' houses; much more complex in **Rome** because of size / population: once water arrived it was passed into large, covered catch-basins. According to Frontinus, once the sediment was deposited here, clean water was released to flow through canals, lead (or terracotta) pipes to storage reservoirs strategically positioned throughout city; from these water was piped through fistulae directly to public fountains, baths, etc and (a few very rich) private houses; the vast majority of people took their water for everyday use (drinking, cooking, washing, etc) from the public fountains

- **uses:**
  two main uses were drinking / washing water taken from public fountains and the public baths: **Pompeii**: drinking fountains on street corners throughout city brought direct from castellum aquae; earliest baths (Stabian Baths) were initially served (unsatisfactorily?) by a well; once the castellum aquae was in use, fistulae brought water here directly; other baths were built, all served directly from the main supply; **Rome**: similar but on grander scale: intricate network of fountains for public use; supplies direct to houses of rich citizens; many bath houses - credit for discussing the prescribed set of baths (Caracalla) as long as detail related to the question; eg emphasis on size, useful to public for hygiene; grand appearance; extra facilities (libraries, conference rooms, etc) that came along with the basic water
- **problems / solutions:**
  (see above for initial problem of growth from early times, partly solved by aqueducts); aqueducts an ongoing problem: in Rome aqueducts suffered from frequent tapping by farmers outside city, leakage, etc; constant remedial work necessary (note Juvenal's comments) but essentially both cities now had relatively reliable water sources; use of lead pipes a problem not fully recognized; must have caused health problems; despite provision of some toilets, growing cities produced problems of sewage disposal, only partly tackled; credit for noting that Pompeii's sewage system was not as advanced as Rome's; in **Pompeii** households generally dealt with their own sewage (often into cesspits, while much drainage took place down the streets); in **Rome** with 1 000 000 citizens public latrines were a regular feature, connected to underground sewers; credit for discussion of the Cloaca Maxima, a covered drainage system (dating from Etruscan times); still major health hazards here (many open sewers; much waste went into the Tiber)

Apply Levels of Response at beginning of Mark Scheme. **[30 marks]**

Option D

10 To what extent did the housing in Pompeii, Herculaneum and Ostia suit the needs of the inhabitants? Give reasons for your answer and refer to specific examples from all three cities.

You might include discussion of:

- **the different social statuses of the inhabitants of each city**
- **needs of the wealthier inhabitants of each city**
- **needs of the less well-off inhabitants**
- **changes over time.**

Discussion might include:

- **social statuses:**
  three very different cities, thriving in different ways (at different times) so quite different needs: **Pompeii**: long-standing small sea port with housing dating from pre-Roman times (eg original parts of 'House of Faun' date from 4th Century BC); mix of classes with significant number of wealthy and middle-class citizens; no real pressure on space for housing ('domus' the norm) but after Roman take-over Pompeii became fashionable holiday home for wealthier Romans; credit for linking this background into discussion of specific houses below; **Herculaneum**: another early city with parallels to Pompeii (close by), but inland, so lacked the trading status of Pompeii; only two houses are set for study and both reflect very much the upper echelons of society: credit for discussion of, eg the 'House of the Stags', as dating from mid 1st Century AD, shortly before town's destruction; fine for students to take Pompeii and Herculaneum together although credit for bringing out any differences between the two; **Ostia**: another longstanding city (founded in 7th Century BC), but despite varied history as a Roman colonia, then base for the imperial fleet, its importance to this question really begins with its increasing importance in the Empire as centre for the grain trade (well after the other two cities were destroyed); this led to a rapid rise in the number of working class (and lower middle class) citizens – in contrast to the other two cities; hence the rise of the 'insulae' (below)
- **wealthier inhabitants:**
  examples here could include: **Pompeii**: 'House of Pansa': classic late 2nd Century BC 'atrium' style house of rich family; credit for basic description of rooms / layout (as long as related to title); focus on atrium suggests mix of business and family accommodation; shop at front with exit into house may suggest slave or poorer client of owner ran associated business; sturdy construction with fine decoration (mosaics / frescoes, etc); 'House of Vettii': contrast in eras as from later years of town (just before destruction) yet similar focus on atrium to 'House of Pansa'; situated in back street, not far from forum; exquisite decoration (credit for discussing mosaics / frescoes, etc); peristylium with marble colonnade, plants and water features everywhere; best materials and excellent workmanship (still standing today!); **Herculaneum**: 'House of Stags': very late villa (c 60 AD); prime position high up with sea views; profuse decoration; clearly a very wealthy family's abode; by now the ubiquitous atrium is a simple entrance hall; features include large summer triclinium – a house for leisure rather than work; **Ostia**: 'Garden Houses': from about 150 BC; 'domus' but of higher quality than earlier examples: two mirror image blocks of flats (3 – possibly 4 – storeys tall) with central corridor; unlike

poorer flats, spacious apartments, running water to all floors, no integrated shops; big communal area with gardens, fountains, etc; excellent quality of construction; credit for detail where used to focus on question

- **less well-off:**
  no examples set from Herculaneum; **Pompeii**: set houses do not really feature those specifically designed for the poor; even so, changed uses of certain 'domus' give evidence: eg 'House of Sallust' was initially a relatively small atrium house from the 3rd Century BC, suggesting a no more than middle class owner but this developed later into a much bigger, grander 'domus'; 'House of the Menander': originally standard atrium house (for middle-class family), and, although later enlarged to 'peristyle house' (for wealthier leisured owner), in its final form took over whole 'insula' apparently to offer mass accommodation for all social classes including flats for poorer citizens; **Ostia**: much clearer here: 'cassette-tipo' good example of lower status provision: only two storeys high; poor quality (tufa) construction; few windows; no courtyard (very dark?); basic decoration (black and white mosaics); need to fetch water from elsewhere; presumed mainly for poorer families; 'House of Diana' had mix of poor and wealthier inhabitants, the ground floor being for the better-off and the quality of accommodation decreasing on each higher storey; credit here again for adding detail of the accommodation as long as focused on the question.
- **changes:**
  clearly the limited range of examples from **Herculaneum** precludes any meaningful discussion of 'change'; for **Pompeii** where the housing examples set cover some 400 years, students should cover the changes in the sort (and size) of housing provided (as suggested by examples above); for **Ostia** the examples cover a much shorter range of years, but there is a clear progression within this era in the sort of (mainly 'domus') housing provided: eg 'Cassette-tipo' from the late 1st Century AD is a simpler (and less impressive) building than the 'House of Diana', built half a century or so later; again higher level essays will reflect a sense of progression in their arguments.

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	2	-	2
02	3	-	3
03	5	5	10
04	8	12	20
Total	**18**	**17**	**35**

Or
Option B

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
05	3	-	3
06	2	-	2
07	5	5	10
08	8	12	20
TOTAL	**18**	**17**	**35**

Section 2

Either
Option C

	AO1	AO2	TOTAL
09	12	18	30
TOTAL	**12**	**18**	**30**

Or
Option D

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

OVERALL

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