

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Pre-U Certificate

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2011 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

9786 CLASSICAL HERITAGE

9786/02

Paper 2 (Foundations of History and Culture – Roman),
maximum raw mark 50

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- Cambridge will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2011 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9786	02

General:

Although the nature of questioning for Paper 1 and 2 essays aims to guide candidates towards certain important areas to focus on each answer, there is no intention that the mark scheme should be prescriptive. All arguments that are relevant and credit worthy should be treated as such. Engagement with the question set (in the examination room) will be an important factor in a successful answer although this may also lead to limitations in the answer. This is preferable to an approach that endeavours to mould pre-worked material of a not too dissimilar nature from the demands of the question.

Examiners are encouraged to refresh their awareness of the question so as not to be carried away by the flow of an argument which may not be absolutely to the point. *Candidates must address the question set and reach an overall judgement, but no set answer is expected. The question can be approached in various ways and what matters is not the conclusions reached but the quality and breadth of the argument and analysis offered by an answer.*

Augustus and the creation of the principate

- 1 (a) **'Augustus rose to power because of his relationship with Julius Caesar.' How far do you agree?** [25]

There will be no way to answer this question without a certain amount of relevant factual detail, namely Octavian's adoption by Julius Caesar, Octavian's response to Caesar's assassination, his alliance with Antony, the Battle of Philippi, the settlement between Octavian and Antony in the early 30s BC and so on.

Candidates should also deal with Octavian's cultivation of the armed forces, and of various important senators. They should perhaps point to his dependence on a number of key advisers (e.g. Agrippa and Maecenas). They should almost certainly discuss the way that, through Maecenas, Octavian mobilised Roman – and, more widely, Italian – public opinion against the increasingly transgressive and orientalising Antony. (Some candidates may very well be tempted to write here about the poets. However, most of our explicit praise of Augustus comes in poems post-Actium.)

There should be some discussion of the Battle of Actium itself, and some good candidates will wisely not end at that point, and will continue to at least 27BC and perhaps to 23BC, in order to argue that Augustus' position is not secure until these settlements have been made.

One would expect good answers to deal with the differing views of Augustus' rise to power as given in Tacitus *Annals* 1, in particular to Octavian's ruthless use of proscription in the 30s BC, and his bribery of armies and officials. Also, there is a lot to be said for discussing the exhausted nature of many Romans: the civil wars had been going, on and off, for one hundred years. As Tacitus says, restriction of freedom may have been a price worth paying for peace and stability. However, that does not explain why the first *princeps* is Octavian rather than Antony. Thus some discussion of Octavian's qualities as a politician may be in order.

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9786	02

(b) Discuss the importance of Augustus' relationship with the Senate. [25]

One would expect good answers to be very careful about stating that there was, as it were, one relationship between *princeps* and senate, as against a dynamic, ever-changing set of relationships.

Clearly, Augustus must have had good relations with a number of individual senators, as a number served as his advisers. On the other hand, the settlements of 27BC and 23BC would seem to indicate that Augustus felt that it was very important to have his powers understood by the senate as not unprecedented and indeed to have those powers ratified by the senate. (Some context here would help, in particular, the assassination of Julius Caesar by a group of senators.) It would help also to be able to include some discussion of the nature of Roman provinces – imperial or senatorial, but to understand that these designations were not necessarily fixed. However, the fact that the province of Egypt, which provided much of Italy's grain, always had an equestrian governor indicates both the importance of the province and the *princeps'* fear that a senatorial governor might use the governorship of Egypt to advance his own political ambitions. The senate remains the key site of (potential) opposition.

Early in the principate it is relatively easy to argue that the senate retains considerable importance. Note also that the relationship works two ways: it is the senate that honours Octavian with the name Augustus.

However, Augustus' almost constant concern with who would succeed him increasingly demonstrates that the nature of political power in Rome has changed. Some candidates may also be able to refer to the decreasing importance of the senate in the successions of Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius and Nero: the army and the provinces have become more important.

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9786	02

Ovid's *Metamorphoses*

2 (a) To what extent do you feel that Ovid's literary style gets in the way of his story-telling? [25]

This is a common criticism levelled against Ovid. Early commentators felt that Ovid could not resist showing off his skill in writing by using various literary devices, often at the expense of the storyline. Yet it is just these techniques which others feel can enhance what might otherwise have been standard stories. The literary devices he uses were ingrained in him during his youth; he employs these devices in a new way and some may feel his ingenuity is to be admired.

Metamorphoses 1 is a set text and stories from here include: the creation; giants; Deucalion and Pyrrha; Daphne; Pan and Syrinx. Further examples should be drawn from other books studied by the candidates. Characterisation might also be discussed.

Better answers might include detailed reference to a range of literary techniques used in these stories together with analysis of the contribution these make to the telling of the tales. Techniques might include:

- patterns, repetition;
- play on words, jokes and humour;
- rhetorical influence in speeches;
- graphic power of description;
- attention to detail.

Candidates must be able to argue a case and justify any assertions that they make.

(b) 'There is little more to the *Metamorphoses* than people changing shapes.' To what extent do you agree with this view? [25]

Metamorphoses 1 is a set text and stories from here include: the creation; giants; Deucalion and Pyrrha; Daphne; Pan and Syrinx. Other examples should be drawn from other books studied by the candidates. Some analysis might be offered of the types of 'change of shape'. A G Lee certainly felt that the *Metamorphoses* were 'in fact a collection of ... short narrative poems.'

There is much for candidates to debate. Candidates might look deeper for any of the motives or aims of Ovid in writing *Metamorphoses* as he says 'from the world's beginning/down to my own lifetime' (1.3-4). Indeed the stories do follow a roughly chronological order.

Candidates should identify a range of different types of metamorphoses; however there is the possibility to look deeper – for example:

- any possible moral lessons;
- Ovid's link with Augustus;
- the attraction of the novelty of the work;
- comparison with Virgil.

(The introduction to the Penguin text has an excellent discussion)

Accept discussion of his use of literary techniques in the question.

Candidates must be able to argue a case and justify any assertions that they make.

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9786	02

Nero as seen through the eyes of Suetonius and Tacitus

- 3 (a) 'An embarrassment when he was out of Rome, and a liability when he was in Rome.'**
How far do you agree with this assessment of Nero's reign? [25]

This question invites the candidate to assess two facets of Nero's behaviour while in power, dividing it on a conventional 'home and abroad' line which fits particularly well with Tacitus' account, but which may also be observed in Suetonius. It requires the candidate to display their own judgement on whether the question's verdict on Nero's behaviour is reasonable, but also demands that they show how they have reached this conclusion from what is written by Suetonius and Tacitus, and therefore requires analysis of the reliability and differing versions of each author. It is essential therefore that they show personal assessment both of Nero's behaviour and of Suetonius and Tacitus as evidence for it.

Tacitus tends to show a degeneration in Nero's character as having its roots abroad and finding its way then to Rome. His account of Nero's singing endeavours in Book 15, for example, show a trial run in a Greek city in Italy, to be followed by a Greek tour, before a return to Rome. He combines this with the strong suggestion that these foreign influences are a cause of moral degeneration; his return to Rome is immediately followed by the party on the lake of Agrippa, then the fire, and so disgust and shame lead to disaster when Nero 'infects' Rome with his non-Roman desires. On the other hand, he had sung at the more private Youth Games, and had previously raced chariots at Rome, albeit in a private setting also; and so the emphasis might rather be seen to be on what is publicly visible at Rome as leading to the degeneration of the city rather than merely the man. Suetonius, too, links degeneracy strongly with foreign – particularly Greek and Egyptian – influence; he in fact observes that Nero left Rome relatively infrequently, and so again this foreign influence spreading into the public domain might be felt to be a more appropriate transition from embarrassment to political damage. Limitations of the evidence are that Tacitus' embarrassment and disgust may well be more his own than that of the contemporary Roman populace; and that Suetonius' anecdotal and biographical approach is concerned with public reaction and political consequences only where they add to the interest of the incident, his subject being less Rome and more Nero the man.

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9786	02

(b) How consistent and convincing is Suetonius' portrait of Nero? [25]

This question asks the candidate to assess Suetonius' picture of Nero's principate on two counts. The guide points also suggest strongly a questioning comparison with Tacitus, and other sources the candidate may have encountered; an answer making no reference to Tacitus or other sources and relying only on internal evidence from Suetonius would have to be very good to establish fully how convincing he is in his account. While superficially a simple enough question, markers should beware of superficiality in responses in order to allow first rate answers to gain full credit. The answer might well include reflections on the nature of ancient historiography, especially any consequences, or even limitations, of Suetonius' anecdotal and biographical method. Candidates may observe that he reports rather uncritically, even credulously, and his sensational accounts may lead to doubt over their accuracy; this, certainly, might affect how convincing he is, as may his lack of named sources. Candidates may also point to the difference in time between Nero's reign and Suetonius' account. Consistency may be seen to be affected by the division into good deeds, followed by bad, and the apparent intention to dwell on the latter may be seen again as affecting reliability. Comparison with Tacitus' account of the *quinquennium Neronis* in Book 13, followed by increasing degeneration in 14 and 15, may provide a balance here. On the other hand, candidates may recognise that Suetonius is working within an ancient biographical tradition; if they see limitations, they may attribute them to the form rather than the writer. The ancient belief that a man's character revealed its true form over time as it was given the opportunity, along with the traditional pattern of an emperor beginning well then declining into tyranny, may be seen to influence Suetonius' presentation here; it may also be seen as conducive to consistency.

Consistency may also be seen in Suetonius' sensationalism; candidates may view him as a more straightforward witness than Tacitus, and thus more credible because it is possible to have a clear view of his own 'agenda', or take. They may also feel that Suetonius might not aim for being wholly convincing; he may rather aim only to entertain and divert with his account. Tacitus' differing aims and methods would form a useful foil in either case.

A variety of responses is possible, but in all cases candidates must show a judgement of the text based on familiarity not only with incidents but with how those incidents are portrayed, and an awareness that Suetonius' account is indeed an account, which requires a discretionary response, and not a factual record.

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9786	02

Roman architecture and building

- 4 (a) **'Roman architecture was essentially derivative.' To what extent do you think that there was no innovation in Roman building design?** [25]

The question is intended to provoke a clear conclusion based on specific examples of Roman architecture; in more basic answers, the conclusion may be in favour of the proposition if discussion focuses primarily on temples, or may argue strongly against it by introducing technological innovations such as arches and concrete into the debate. More careful analyses of evidence may note a syncretising approach which sees both innovation in technical matters, such as vaulting and poured concrete (e.g. the Colosseum or the Pantheon of Hadrian), and a respectful approach to temple design evidenced in the written accounts by Vitruvius and in the temples seen in the Roman Forum and at Arles, where the Maison Carrée imitates both Greek design and construction.

There should be some discussion of *development* in Roman building design; this is seen particularly in the introduction of poured concrete structures, which themselves imitate vaulting and arches which had been developed in brick and stone, and in the development of particular styles of building such as temples and basilicas. These need to be discussed in sufficient detail and placed in a historical/chronological context in order to support balanced judgements and developed arguments.

Some attempt must be made to address *derivative* as well. There may be discussion of borrowings and homage paid to Greek styles (so Vitruvius, particularly in temple-building), and of the essentially conservative styles of construction seen all over the empire – though in different sizes and scales – of buildings such as basilicas, villas and bath-houses. Discussion of developments both at Rome and in the provinces should be credited where it is found.

- (b) **'The genius of Roman architecture was in combining technological and aesthetic excellence.' How far do the buildings you have studied bear out this view?** [25]

The question asks for supported discussion of examples of Roman structures, of which there are many; candidates need not provide an exhaustive catalogue, but look for a good choice of examples to support the argument developed. The use of arches and vaults in poured concrete allowed for larger spaces to be covered in single spans from the time of Nero onwards (baths of Diocletian and Caracalla and Hadrian's Pantheon being prime examples) in a way never seen before, and others such as the Colosseum and the Pont du Gard exploit the arch as an imitation of what could be achieved in brick and/or stone. While their technical innovations may be dealt with in a fairly straightforward manner even by weaker candidates, there must also be some exploration of the aesthetic qualities of these buildings; there may be some appreciation of the delicacy of line or the harmony of some buildings, or the effect on onlookers of the massive lines of Diocletian's baths, for example. Stronger responses may question the success (in aesthetic terms) of some buildings, such as Hadrian's Pantheon, where the façade, still bearing Agrippa's names, is too low by 10 feet/3 metres and can be criticised for being out of proportion.

There may be discussion of the functionality of these structures as being primary, with aesthetic considerations to some extent secondary (though the comments about architecture in general in Vitruvius argue the contrary), and an appreciation of the view summed up by Wheeler that Roman buildings were designed for appreciation from the *inside* in contrast with Greek buildings designed to be appreciated from *outside*.

Whatever examples are chosen as support, the answer must contain a developed argument and justified conclusions based upon them.

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9786	02

Cicero and the fall of the republic

- 5 (a) 'Although an outsider, Cicero's determination and abilities enabled him to succeed.'
How far do you agree with this assessment? [25]

A successful answer to the question should demonstrate some knowledge of Cicero's 'non-Roman' origins from Arpinum, his family background, lack of establishment figures in his ancestry, lack of connections to or with important figures and influential families of his day. Since this is a generally accepted and well-documented view, this should be information that is readily accessible to candidates and straightforward to mould in responding to the first part of the question – 'outsider' – and might then lead to a discussion of his determination to succeed, for example through cultivating important people as well as his long friendship with Atticus.

Although the answer to the second part of the question – 'abilities' – may appear obvious (his talent as a public speaker/forensic orator), it is to be hoped that candidates may address this through:

- his emergence with the *pro Roscio* (and subsequent health problems);
- his desire to remain in the public gaze and being an ardent self-publicist (hence the *Quaestor* story, the problems of exile, keeping his speeches for publication);
- his ambition to reach the highest offices of the state;
- his successful legal/political speaking which allowed him to gain the indebtedness of influential figures, the support of Atticus, all contributed to his success in reaching the consulship.

It is possible that the best candidates may show how insubstantial his support was and how easily he was jettisoned. They may also query whether self-delusion might be considered one of these abilities as also his resolution in supporting some ideals and individuals and reticence in supporting others (*Concordia ordinum*, Pompey, Julius Caesar, Mark Antony).

Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9786	02

- (b) 'Cicero deliberately misrepresented the opposition he encountered during his consulship to enhance the importance of his achievements.' How far do you agree with this assessment of Cicero's year as consul? [25]

'Before long the sudden collapse of Catiline's sorry crew made the whole business something of a nine days' wonder, except to Cicero who frequently re-lived in memory his days of triumph. There were some Romans who were probably quite content that all memory of it should disappear as soon as possible.' [Cowell, *Cicero and the Roman Republic* (p.184)]

A successful answer to this question should examine the situation that Cicero found himself in after declarations at the beginning of his consulship that he would be a '*popularis* consul' when speaking on the agrarian law and then being forced to throw himself on to the side of the *optimates*.

Candidates may also consider:

- the importance of Catiline's opposition in the consular elections;
- the amount of what we might consider as slanderous or hearsay information that was presented as evidence;
- the circumstantial nature of the evidence against Catiline and whether he was manoeuvred into a hopeless position by Cicero in order to increase the apparent danger and importance of the situation;
- the Allobroges and their 'proof' of guilt;
- the force of the Catilinarian orations;
- the passing of the SCU and the subsequent execution of conspirators.

While an acceptable answer to the question may be achieved by recounting the events of Cicero's year as consul, it is to be hoped that candidates may arrive at some kind of evaluation as to whether Cicero deliberately misrepresented the opposition he faced and so make a judgement on the core part of the question. Some candidates may wish to consider the aftermath to this year as Consul with Cicero's exile, as well as his continual desire to be a self-publicist.

Page 10	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9786	02

Urban archaeology of the Roman Near East

- 6 (a) **To what extent can the religious and ritual beliefs of the urban population of the Roman Near East be established by a study of the archaeological remains?** [25]

The question invites candidates to use archaeological indicators of religion and ritual to model such practices in the urban centres of the Roman Near East. Inscription evidence is a viable part of the response; ancient literature may be used but not to drive the essay. Further, literary evidence might be subject to evaluation in the light of the archaeology.

A partially satisfactory answer might fail to discuss different types of religion – see below – and may be highly descriptive. Such responses might have a very limited grasp of archaeological indicators and interpretations of religion and ritual.

Evidence can be drawn from numerous sources; in particular personal as opposed to civic religion might be discussed. For the former, small finds and smaller shrines, perhaps contained within private houses, are useful. For the latter the larger civic religious buildings of the cities are of obvious use. For both, inscription and art evidence is of especial interest. Candidates should be aware of the development of religion and ritual, the import of alien practices from other parts of the Roman Empire and from cultures outside the imperial frontiers. Worship of the imperial cult is an obvious source for discussion here. Better responses may place religion and ritual in a firm sociological context.

Archaeological techniques will centre on indicators of religion and ritual and their archaeological interpretation.

Candidates must be able to argue a case and justify any assertions that they make.

- (b) **To what extent were the cities of the Roman Near East primarily storage and distribution centres for the agricultural produce of their territories?** [25]

The question invites a discussion of the primary economic function of the Roman cities of the Near East. The premise of the question might be accepted or rejected or a middle course may be taken, there is no set response. The question demands that the candidate investigate the relationship of the city with its surrounding territory and the wider imperial economy.

A partially satisfactory answer might argue a one dimensional function for the city and may be highly descriptive in nature. It will accept evidence at face value and be unable to deploy archaeological techniques to support analysis.

Evidence can be drawn from the buildings and structures of the cities developed to support agriculture, markets, storage areas, commercial buildings etc. Inscription evidence is of use, so too are small finds – organic and non-organic. Transportation hubs such as ports may be discussed in relation to the question, so too the road networks which connected the cities on land. Regional surveys of the territories of the cities are of especial use, so too modelling of the agricultural economy. Wider economic contacts with the empire should be investigated.

Archaeological techniques of use are environmental and economic modelling, soil and pollen analysis, fall-off analysis and central place theory.

Candidates must be able to argue a case and justify any assertions that they make.