

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS General Certificate of Education Advanced Subsidiary Level and Advanced Level

CLASSICAL STUDIES

9274/02

Paper 2 Roman Civilisation SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME For Examination from 2011

1 hour 30 minutes

MAXIMUM MARK: 50

This document consists of 11 printed pages and 1 blank page.



[Turn over

9274/01 and 02 Generic marking descriptors: gobbet essays (AS)

- The full range of marks will be used as a matter of course.
- Examiners will look for the 'best fit', not a 'perfect fit' in applying the Levels.
- Examiners will provisionally award the middle mark in the Level and then moderate up/down according to individual qualities within the answer.
- Question-specific mark schemes will be neither exhaustive nor prescriptive. Appropriate, substantiated responses will always be rewarded.

Level/marks	Descriptors
Level 1 13–15	ANSWERS MAY NOT BE PERFECT, BUT WILL REPRESENT THE VERY BEST THAT MAY BE EXPECTED AT THIS LEVEL. • will be comprehensive in coverage; • will be detailed in knowledge; • will be detailed in the use of specific examples in support of points made; • will be attentive to all parts of the question in equal depth; • will be lucid in style and organisation; • will show evidence of individual thought and insight; • the answer is fluent and the grammar, punctuation and spelling are all precise.
Level 2 10–12	 will be very good in coverage; will be supported with good/adequate examples and illustrations; will be attentive to all parts of the question in some depth; will be well organised and clearly expressed; may have some minor errors; for the most part, the answer is fluent and shows an accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
Level 3 7–9	 will be adequate in coverage of question requirements, but perhaps unbalanced in treatment; will be supported with fewer examples and detail; will be too general; may be stylistically clumsy or inconsistent; may contain irrelevant material; shows some fluency, but on the whole shows an accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
Level 4 4–6	 will be deficient or limited in knowledge; will show misunderstanding or misinterpretation of question; will use few or irrelevant examples; will be muddled and limited in expression; will shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling, but contains frequent errors.
Level 5 0–3	 will show serious misunderstanding of the question or lack of knowledge; will show factual inaccuracies; will not use examples; will not make relevant points; will show significant weaknesses in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

9274/01 and 02 Generic marking descriptors: full essays (AS)

- The full range of marks will be used as a matter of course.
- Examiners will look for the 'best fit', not a 'perfect fit' in applying the Levels.
- Examiners will provisionally award the middle mark in the Level and then moderate up/down according to individual qualities within the answer.
- Question-specific mark schemes will be neither exhaustive nor prescriptive (unless specified to the contrary). Appropriate, substantiated responses will always be rewarded.

Level/marks	Descriptors
Level 1 21–25	ANSWERS MAY NOT BE PERFECT, BUT WILL REPRESENT THE VERY BEST THAT MAY BE EXPECTED AT THIS LEVEL. • will be comprehensive in coverage; • will be detailed in knowledge; • will be detailed in the use of specific examples in support of points made; • will be attentive to all parts of the question in equal depth; • will be lucid in style and organisation; • will show evidence of individual thought and insight; • the answer is fluent and the grammar, punctuation and spelling are all precise.
Level 2 16–20	 will be very good in coverage; will be supported with good/adequate examples and illustrations; will be attentive to all parts of the question in some depth; will be well organised and clearly expressed; may have some minor errors; for the most part, the answer is fluent and shows an accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
Level 3 11–15	 will be adequate in coverage of question requirements, but perhaps unbalanced in treatment; will be supported with fewer examples and detail; will be too general; may be stylistically clumsy or inconsistent; may contain irrelevant material; shows some fluency, but on the whole shows an accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
Level 4 6–10	 will be deficient or limited in knowledge; will show misunderstanding or misinterpretation of question; will use few or irrelevant examples; will be muddled and limited in expression; will shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling, but contains frequent errors.
Level 5 0–5	 will show serious misunderstanding of the question or lack of knowledge; will show factual inaccuracies; will not use examples; will not make relevant points; will show significant weaknesses in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

Question-specific material

- The Generic Bands apply to all gobbet and full essay and are the basis of assessment.
- Examiners will assess which Band best reflects most of the answer. An answer will not be required to demonstrate all of the descriptions in a particular Level to qualify for a Band.
- Question-specific mark schemes gives advice about <u>possible</u> content and approaches that may be seen in answers. They are neither exhaustive nor prescriptive (unless specified to the contrary). Appropriate, substantiated responses will always be rewarded.

Augustus

1 (a) (i) Name <u>two</u> of the sons of Agrippa.

[Any 2: 1 each]

Gaius Caesar, Lucius Caesar, Postumus Agrippa.

(ii) Explain the significance of the tribunician power.

[2]

The tribune of the people could veto any motion of the Senate or any other magistrate. This gave a tribune complete control over which laws were passed.

(iii) What role did Maecenas play in Augustus' administration?

[1]

Maecenas was in charge of Augustus' propaganda.

(iv) What plans did Augustus have for the sons of Agrippa? Why did these plans fail? [5]

Augustus saw Gaius and Lucius as his successors. They were given honours before they were old enough to receive them, and were sent out to the provinces to learn how to govern. They both died before they could succeed to the throne. Postumus was a surly youth who was banished to the island of Planasia.

(b) Using the passages as a starting point, explain who you think was more important to the success of Augustus, Agrippa or Tiberius. Justify your answer. [15]

SEE THE GOBBET MARKING DESCRIPTORS FOR THE LEVELS.

Effective answers need to consider the relative merits of both figures and justify the choice made.

Agrippa was instrumental in Octavian's rise to power, helping him win the wars against Sextus Pompeius and Mark Antony. He also helped to administer the Empire, being given Augustus' ring when he was ill and being appointed his heir when Marcellus died. Much of the building programme was his doing.

Tiberius was a reluctant successor who often argued with his step-father and even retired from public life. He was, however, a very good general who solved problems caused by Agrippa's death and the Varian disaster. He helped run the Empire in Augustus' old age and succeeded him, keeping his constitutional reforms intact.

2 'Nothing but a power-hungry dictator.' How far do you agree with this assessment of Augustus' career? [25]

SEE THE ESSAY MARKING DESCRIPTORS FOR THE LEVELS.

Octavian seized the chance offered to him by Julius Caesar's death and his relationship to him to gain power. His early career is full of many illegal acts and ruthlessness to increase such power as he had. He gradually eliminated all his rivals and became the most powerful man in the state. His constitutional settlements were designed to give him more power whilst maintaining the illusion that democratic government had been restored. He ensured that his position was passed on to his heir. However, he did restore peace to an empire ravaged by continual civil war and he made it prosperous again. He spent a great deal of his own personal fortune in providing new facilities for the city and in restoring many of the buildings.

3 Why do you think that Octavian won the war against Antony?

[25]

SEE THE ESSAY MARKING DESCRIPTORS FOR THE LEVELS.

There are many reasons for Octavian's victory. He had the support of the Roman people, gained through a sustained propaganda campaign, not so much against Antony as against Cleopatra. The war was portrayed as Rome and its virtues against the decadent East. Agrippa was an experienced naval commander, and Antony made the mistake of preferring to fight at sea, rather than on land where he had superior forces. The actual battle went all in Octavian's favour – Antony's ships were undermanned and not seaworthy. Cleopatra fled the scene, forcing Antony to follow, thus abandoning his men. Cleopatra's presence also unsettled Antony's Roman supporters.

Virgil

4 (a) (i) Who has just appeared to Aeneas? What makes Aeneas climb onto the roof of the house? [2 x 1]

Hector; the news of the fall of Troy.

(ii) Look at the simile 'like a shepherd when a furious south wind ... listening to the sound without knowing what it is.' (lines 2–6) Explain two points of similarity between the simile and the scene it is intended to illustrate. [4]

Any two of the following: [1 per point + 1 per explanation] Fire = Greeks torching the city;

- Cornfield, smiling crops = Troy and how it has been built up;
- Wild winds, mountain torrent = Powerful natural imagery to highlight the power and destruction of the Greeks;
- Shepherd = Aeneas in his confusion, later to be the shepherd of his people.
- (iii) 'Soon the great house of Deiphobus ... reflected the flames.' (lines 7–9) Find two ways Virgil highlights the fierceness of the fire and explain their effect. [4]

Any **two** of the following: [1 per point + 1 per explanation]

- Repeition of 'already' highlights the speed of the blaze;
- It also managed to quickly vanquish a 'broad' mansion;
- It quickly jumps to Ucalegon's house must be a big fire;
- Aeneas is dumbstruck by it 'out of my senses'.
- (b) Using this passage as a starting point, how far does Aeneas' character develop in Book 2 of the *Aeneid*? [15]

SEE THE GOBBET MARKING DESCRIPTORS FOR THE LEVELS.

Aeneas is a prototype Roman hero. Virgil is trying to show that the values of a Homeric hero are redundant in an age which is no longer heroic and instead they need to be supplanted by the qualities of 'pietas' – respect for the gods, family, country and subordinates. This change is reflected in Book 2 of the *Aeneid*.

In the passage, Aeneas thinks like a typical Homeric hero where battle-madness or 'furor' gets the better of him. This happens on numerous occasions e.g. after the words of Panthus where he returns to the middle of the city with a band of men in pursuit of certain death. In the passage, he comments on the glory to be found in dying in arms. He also nearly murders Helen in a fit of madness and also acts recklessly when his father refuses to leave and when he realises he has lost Creusa. He needs the help of his mother, father, wife to keep these outdated qualities in check and only reluctantly takes up the burden of his destiny at the end. This transformation is most notably seen as he carries his father out of the city. However, candidates might also note that Aeneas is still not immune from lapses back into his more reckless way of behaving. For instance, it might be worth considering how he behaves when he learns of Creusa's disappearance.

5 'The Aeneid is just a piece of political propaganda.' Discuss this view in relation to the books of the Aeneid you have studied. [25]

SEE THE ESSAY MARKING DESCRIPTORS FOR THE LEVELS.

Candidates should discuss the political dimensions to the epic and make reference to the big prophetic passages extolling the future greatness of the Roman Empire and Augustus himself. They might consider how Virgil indirectly praises him with the simile in the calming of the storm in Book 1. The example Aeneas sets is also important, as is the praise of the virtues of 'pietas', the emphasis on the importance of morality and the worshipping of the gods. However, there might also be awareness of Virgil's private voice where Rome's greatness comes at the expense of personal suffering on an individual level. Episodes worthy of consideration might include: the tragedy of Dido, the depiction of warfare.

To what extent do the gods and goddesses behave in a godlike way in the books of the *Aeneid* you have studied? [25]

SEE THE ESSAY MARKING DESCRIPTORS FOR THE LEVELS.

Candidates are free to offer their own interpretation of godlike and answers will be assessed with this in mind. Jupiter's authority is manifest. He is seen as in charge and the holder of the Fates when he reveals Aeneas' destiny to Venus. His omnipotence is never doubted nor is his sexual potency – i.e. larbas. His vigilance might be in doubt in allowing his wife and daughter so much room to meddle with destiny and he does not seem too observant to Aeneas languishing at Carthage. However, it is Jupiter who sends down Hermes to bid Aeneas to depart from Carthage.

Perhaps Juno's behaviour is not so godlike in comparison. Her hatred of the Trojans might seem to be caused by some trivial reasons and maybe she is portrayed too anthropomorphically. She is prepared to bribe Aeolus and to use innocent victims such as Dido in her schemes, but she does show a level of compassion in allowing Dido to die (end of Book 4).

Typically, Venus looks after Aeneas' interests. It is she who engineered Dido's love for the hero to ensure he has a favourable reception at Carthage. She appears to him in the fall of Troy and reveals to him the intervention of the gods and keeps his family safe, helps him find his way to Carthage and also to find the Golden Bough. However, she is deceptive – she claims not to know whether Jupiter would approve of the merging of the two nations, but she has had a sneak preview of the scrolls of fate in Book 1. Some candidates might argue that Venus' actions in agreeing to the union are neither in her son's best interests nor are fair on Dido.

There is room for possible discussion of other deities, e.g. Hermes, Iris, Poseidon.

Juvenal

7 (a) (i) Who is the host of this party? Who does he refer to in the first line?

[2]

Virro; expensive/good looking boy.

(ii) What according to this passage has the guest had to attend daily to receive an invitation to this party? What is the relationship called between the host and guest?

Salutatio; patron/client.

(iii) In this passage, find three examples of Juvenal's satiric technique. Write out the example, identify the technique and explain its effect. [6]

Any **three** of the following [1 per technique + 1 per explanation]

- Rhetorical question 'will he ever get round to you?';
- Repetition 'results';
- Role reversal slave resenting waiting on client;
- Irony client described as 'ancient hanger on';
- Accumulation of examples 'here's another';
- Exaggeration/description 'almost hard to break';
- Contrast between bread for patron and client;
- Sarcasm 'show reverence for the bread-pan'.
- (b) Using this passage as a starting point, what message do you think Juvenal was trying to put across in Satire 5? In your answer, you should include discussion of both the content and structure of Satire 5. [15]

SEE THE GOBBET MARKING DESCRIPTORS FOR THE LEVELS.

The subject matter of Satire 5 is perfect for the purpose of criticising the patron/client system. The description of the dinner party offers an immediacy to the topic and ample opportunities for making pert criticisms. Candidates should examine the description of the dinner and be able to recall the differences in the quality of the dinner service (which serves to highlight the differences between the patron and client). This might include the differences in the quality of:

- wine:
- what they drink out of;
- water:
- bread;
- fish;
- meat;
- fruit.

It also points to the degradation that the client suffers and the wilful extravagance that the patron enjoys. The elevated position some of the slaves have obtained would be worth commenting on, as would the advice Juvenal offers both to his friend as well as the host of the party. Throughout, the structure reinforces the message – the reader is part of the dinner party as it unfolds and different characters and courses of the dinner are brought on in a natural sequence of events. The way Juvenal convincingly interjects his opinions and advice between these scenes gives his satire a real flow.

8 What arguments does Juvenal put forward for not living in Rome in Satire 3? How do his satiric techniques highlight his arguments? [25]

SEE THE ESSAY MARKING DESCRIPTORS FOR THE LEVELS.

Essentially, Juvenal is arguing that life in Rome has become so bad that it is time to leave it. He includes the following points in his argument:

- There is no room for decent professions;
- Dishonesty thrives;
- Especially when dishonesty is connected to the Greeks;
- The Greeks are pushing the native Romans aside;
- Everything in Rome is linked to money;
- Life in the country is better and safer;
- Rome is also a dangerous place to live, especially at night.

Juvenal uses a host of satiric techniques. They range from literary devices (e.g. rhetorical question, irony, obscenity, anti-climax, hyperbole, mockery of epic) to compositional devices (e.g. cinematic technique, vividly drawn scenes, conversational style, range of quick changing examples). Answers should cover a range of these devices, with appropriate examples, briefly showing how they strengthen Juvenal's argument.

9 Explain who or what you think Juvenal hated the most in Roman society?

[25]

SEE THE ESSAY MARKING DESCRIPTORS FOR THE LEVELS.

This broad question allows candidates to use what they have learned from studying the Satires about Roman society and the defects in it which Juvenal draws his audience's attention to. Areas that may be discussed include:

- Corrupting power of wealth;
- Influence of foreigners;
- Deficiencies in the patron client system;
- Lack of morality;
- Legacy hunting;
- Dangers and disadvantages of living in Rome;
- Inadequacies of certain emperors, e.g. Nero;
- The dinner party:
- The immorality of women.

Candidates should examine a range of topics, make close reference to the appropriate Satires and come to a reasoned argument about which angle of Roman society annoyed Juvenal the most.

Roman Architecture

10 (i) Where is this structure, and when was it built

[2]

Leptis Magna; 1-2 AD.

(ii) How were buildings such as this often funded?

[1]

Through the generosity of a local citizen.

(iii) What evidence is there to associate this building with religion?

[3]

Any three of:

- marble altar on steps from orchestra;
- temple to Ceres Augusta at top of cavea;
- statues of Dioskouroi in front of scaena;
- temple to deified emperors within the theatre precinct.

(iv) Explain the similarities and differences between the cavea and the orchestra. [4]

<u>Similarities</u>: Both were semi-circular. The orchestra was a seating area and the cavea could be because the most important citizens often had their bisellia on steps around the cavea's rim.

<u>Differences</u>: The cavea was the seating area for the audience whereas the orchestra was the area used by the chorus. The cavea was a raked, tiered part of the structure whereas the orchestra was a flat area.

(v) This design of this building was based on the model created originally by the Greeks. Outline the ways in which this building is typically Roman and how it differed from a Greek design. [15]

SEE THE GOBBET MARKING DESCRIPTORS FOR THE LEVELS.

Answers may include some of the following for discussion:

Typically Roman:

- Members of the great and the good' had their own entrances and seating areas;
- Their seats, rather like thrones, often made of marble, were decorated with carvings.
 There were also boxes for the important officials of the town/city.
- Ordinary seating was arranged into tiers by walkways;
- Ordinary seating was further divided into wedge shapes by radial staircases.

Different to Greek design:

Like other Roman theatres, it draws directly on the Greek plan, but

- Greek theatres were built into sloping hillsides, whereas there were several variations in the construction of Roman theatres (e.g. totally free-standing buildings or, as here at Leptis Magna, built partially into the rock);
- Early Roman theatres were built of wood (and perhaps temporary) whereas, as far as we know, Greek theatres were only ever built of stone;
- The Greek orchestra was round, the Roman orchestra was semi-circular;
- The Roman stage building (skene) was more elaborate than the Greek;
- The front of the Roman stage building (scaena frons) was extended so that it was as high as the top level of the seating and was joined to the cavea(unlike the Greek);
- An awning was provided in Roman theatre, but not in Greek ones;
- Roman theatres felt more enclosed and had a more intimate atmosphere.

11 Of the temples you have studied which do you think would have made the greatest impact on the ancient visitor, and why? In your answer, you should include discussion of the Pantheon in Rome and at least <u>one</u> other temple. [25]

SEE THE ESSAY MARKING DESCRIPTORS FOR THE LEVELS.

Candidates must have studied the Pantheon and at least <u>one</u> other temple. The Pantheon was built between 118-125 AD by the Emperor Hadrian and combines Greek and Roman architectural elements. It does not matter which of the temples candidates think visitors would have made the greatest impact. The sheer size of the Pantheon would probably have made a great impact on visitors, as would its design and its internal decoration. On the other hand, more conservative visitors may have preferred the more regular shaped temples while a good case could be made for visitors being impressed by the stylistic quality and beauty/serenity of some very fine small temples (e.g. the Maison Carrée, Nîmes). Candidates might stick to architecture/aesthetics, but some may extend their answers to consider impact in relation to function: visiting these buildings to worship.

Expect good consideration of two temples and a strong line of argument.

12 'Roman architects were driven only by practical considerations; they were not interested in aesthetic considerations.' How far does your study of Roman architecture support this view?

SEE THE ESSAY MARKING DESCRIPTORS FOR THE LEVELS.

It is easy to see why this widely held view might find support among candidates. Plans of Roman buildings/structures do reveal evidence of the practical considerations. The Romans built huge public buildings which were not just for show. When designing buildings, the architects thought seriously about the function of the building. There were also considerations such as materials to be used and the cost of such massive structures. The Romans were adept at using relatively cheap materials such as brick and concrete. These materials would then be faced with more expensive stone such as marble. Many extant buildings, however, no longer have the facing material and visitors see brick facades. If Roman architects were not interested in aesthetic considerations, why did they use facing materials at all? The shapes and interiors of many buildings were also quite beautiful.

It does not matter whether candidates agree or disagree with the statement. The key here is a strong line of argument, well supported by reference to particular buildings.

BLANK PAGE