

**CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS**

**Pre-U Certificate**

[www.XtremePapers.com](http://www.XtremePapers.com)

## **MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series**

### **9786 CLASSICAL HERITAGE**

**9786/02**

Paper 2 Foundations of History & 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 should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2014 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9786</b>	<b>02</b>

**Essay: Generic Marking Descriptors for Paper 2**

- 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. Good performance on one AO may compensate for shortcomings on others. HOWEVER, essays not deploying material over the full range of the two AOs will be most unlikely to attain a mark in Level 5.
- 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. Answers may develop a novel and possibly intuitive response to a question. This is to be credited if arguments are fully substantiated.
- The ratio of marks AO1 to AO2 is 2:1

<b>Level/marks</b>	<b>Descriptors</b>
<b>5</b> <b>25 – 21</b> <b>marks</b>	<p>ANSWERS MAY NOT BE PERFECT, BUT WILL REPRESENT THE BEST THAT MAY BE EXPECTED OF AN 18-YEAR-OLD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly focussed analysis that answers the question convincingly.</li> <li>• Sustained argument with a strong sense of direction. Strong, substantiated conclusions.</li> <li>• Gives full expression to material relevant to both AOs.</li> <li>• Towards the bottom, may be a little prosaic or unbalanced in coverage yet the answer is still comprehensively argued.</li> <li>• Wide range of citation of relevant information, handled with confidence to support analysis and argument.</li> <li>• Excellent exploration of the wider context, if relevant.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b> <b>20-16</b> <b>marks</b>	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW MANY FEATURES OF LEVEL 5, BUT THE QUALITY WILL BE UNEVEN ACROSS THE ANSWER.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A determined response to the question with clear analysis across most but not all of the answer.</li> <li>• Argument developed to a logical conclusion, but parts lack rigour. Strong conclusions adequately substantiated.</li> <li>• Response covers both AOs, but is especially strong on one AO so reaches this Level by virtue of the argument/analysis.</li> <li>• Good but limited and/or uneven range of relevant information used to support analysis and argument. Description is avoided.</li> <li>• Good analysis of the wider context, if relevant.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b> <b>15 – 11</b> <b>marks</b>	<p>THE ARGUMENT WILL BE REASONABLY COMPETENT, BUT LEVEL 3 ANSWERS WILL BE LIMITED AND/OR UNBALANCED.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engages well with the question although analysis is patchy and, at the lower end, of limited quality.</li> <li>• Tries to argue and draw conclusions, but this breaks down in significant sections of description.</li> <li>• The requirements of both AOs are addressed, but without any real display of flair or thinking.</li> <li>• Good but limited and/or uneven range of relevant information used to describe rather than support analysis and argument.</li> <li>• Fair display of knowledge to describe the wider context, if relevant.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b> <b>10 – 5</b> <b>marks</b>	<p>ANSWERS WILL SHOW A GENERAL MISMATCH BETWEEN QUESTION &amp; ANSWER.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some engagement with the question, but limited understanding of the issues. Analysis and conclusions are sketchy at best.</li> <li>• Limited argument within an essentially descriptive response. Conclusions are limited/thin.</li> <li>• Factually limited and/or uneven. Some irrelevance.</li> <li>• Perhaps stronger on AO1 than AO2 (which might be addressed superficially or ignored altogether).</li> <li>• Patchy display of knowledge to describe the wider context, if relevant.</li> </ul>
<b>1</b> <b>4 – 0</b> <b>marks</b>	<p>ANSWERS IN LEVEL 1 WILL SHOW A CLEAR SENSE OF THE CANDIDATE HAVING LOST CONTROL OF HIS/HER MATERIAL.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little or no engagement with the question. Little or no analysis offered.</li> <li>• Little or no argument. Any conclusions are very weak. Assertions are unsupported and/or of limited relevance.</li> <li>• Little or no display of relevant information.</li> <li>• Little or no attempt to address AO2.</li> <li>• Little or no reference to the wider context, if relevant.</li> </ul>

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9786	02

## Augustus and the Principate

### General

Although the nature of questioning for Paper 1 and 2 essays aims to guide candidates towards certain important areas to focus on in 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 as set (in the exam 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 constantly refresh their awareness of the question so as not to be carried away by the flow of an argument that 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.*

- 1 (a) **To what extent did the settlements of 27 and 23 BC secure Augustus' position? Explain your answer.**

**[In answering this question you might consider, among other things, the detail of the two settlements, Augustus' view of the settlements in *Res Gestae*; other factors which had previously helped to establish Augustus' position.]**

### **Specific:**

Candidates will need to be very accurate in the detail that they give about the two settlements. In particular they may wish to concentrate on the adapted republican powers that were confirmed by the two settlements (*tribunicia potestas* and *proconsulare imperium*). It is likely that the significance of those two powers will be evaluated. Candidates may also wish to consider the way in which Augustus presents the settlement of 27 in *Res Gestae*, together with the idea found in other evidence that the settlement was represented as the restoration of the republic. Candidates may wish to consider what problems both settlements were designed to address; to do that, they may need to include some specific political events (especially in relation to the settlement of 23 BC). Candidates may also wish to consider other important factors such as Augustus' wealth, his control of the army and the Praetorian guard and his reputation in the provinces.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9786</b>	<b>02</b>

**(b) Why was it important for Augustus to establish an imperial dynasty? Explain your answer.**

**[In answering this question you might consider, among other things, the various attempts Augustus made to establish a succession; Augustus' interest in his own legacy, the importance of the imperial family in Roman politics.]**

### **Specific**

Candidates will need to be clear about the thrust of the question. They will of course need to include accurate detail about Marcellus, Marcus Agrippa, Gaius and Lucius and, finally, Tiberius. They will also need to be accurate about the various ways that Augustus chose to indicate a possible successor (e.g. shared consulships, military commands, iconography of the Ara Pacis – note also the Mausoleum). Possible answers to the 'why' include, for instance: a genuine desire to preserve the stability won at such a high price; a desire for his own achievements to be protected and championed by those close to him. Candidates may wish to consider the extent to which Augustus is once again following, though adapting, a republican model (there had been many famous and powerful families during the republic); candidates may also wish to argue that Augustus did not simply choose a successor but showed that successor doing important jobs. The two powers that underlay the principate – tribunician power and proconsular imperium – were of course given to Tiberius, who acted in the last years of the reign as a sort of co-ruler. It is possible to argue as well that Augustus was – at least in part – genuinely interested in establishing a more stable form of government for Rome and the empire.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9786	02

## Ovid's *Metamorphoses*

### General

Although the nature of questioning for Paper 1 and 2 essays aims to guide candidates towards certain important areas to focus on in 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 as set (in the exam 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 constantly refresh their awareness of the question so as not to be carried away by the flow of an argument that 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.*

- 2 (a) **'Ovid's *Metamorphoses* gives us a strikingly different view of the world from our own.'**  
To what extent do you agree?

**[In answering this question you might consider, among other things, the creation story as told by Ovid; the stories of transformation in the *Metamorphoses*; the significance of these stories and the world view which they suggest.]**

### **Specific**

The question should lead candidates to outline the creation myth as presented in book 1 of the *Metamorphoses* and consider what it suggests about the nature of the world and the gods' role in its development. They might then consider different questions which arise from this: the physical development of the world, the relationship between men and the gods, and what the stories suggest to us about the physical world around us. Using stories from elsewhere in the text, they might also consider the idea that people are transformed into different elements of the world around us, and that the animals, trees and other plants which we see around us are more than they appear at first sight.

Candidates can use any of the stories which they have studied to exemplify their points and further their argument. Candidates should be free to take whatever approach seems suitable to this question, and may wish to focus on key areas. Candidates might also consider what is meant by the phrase 'strikingly different'. Some might consider this in relation to our current views of the world and its development, whilst others might place this in the context of ideas around at the time of Ovid. Both approaches should be well rewarded.

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9786</b>	<b>02</b>

- (b) 'Love motivates everything that happens in the *Metamorphoses*.' To what extent do you agree with this assessment?

[In answering this question you might consider, among other things, the stories in which love is a key element; the forms which love takes; the extent to which love alone motivates the actions of the important characters in the *Metamorphoses*.]

### **Specific**

Candidates should argue with the proposition in the question, and consider what exactly it means. The question leaves it open to them to choose which stories they might use. They may also consider what is meant by love motivating the actions: is this purely romantic love, or can one look more widely and consider desire which turns into anger.

Candidates may also consider other factors which motivate action in the stories, but might argue that even in these love is a key factor. Examples might include Daedalus' desire to leave Crete leading to his attempts at flight (Book 8), Jupiter's motivation in the Flood (Book 1), Mars' request for the *apotheosis* of Romulus (Book 14).

Candidates should be able to use any of the stories which they have studied to support their arguments.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9786	02

## Nero as seen through the eyes of Suetonius and Tacitus

### General

Although the nature of questioning for Paper 1 and 2 essays aims to guide candidates towards certain important areas to focus on in 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 as set (in the exam 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 constantly refresh their awareness of the question so as not to be carried away by the flow of an argument that 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.*

- 3 (a) **‘Suetonius’ biography gives us a clearer idea of what Nero was like as a man than Tacitus’ history.’ Explain to what extent you think this is a reasonable judgement, based on your reading of Suetonius and Tacitus.**

### **Specific**

Candidates may well have differing views of exactly what view of Nero they have from reading Tacitus and Suetonius, but whatever these views are, they should be stated with reasonable clarity in order to build a successful answer to this question. Differences and similarities in the character portrayed may form a large part of the response, but the question does focus on clarity, and for the higher bands really requires some notable attempt to deal with this issue. Ultimately, a candidate should really be saying which author helps them to feel like they know Nero better, and why. Clarity is also distinct from reliability; while reliability may play a large part in a response, it should not be the only thing discussed.

Candidates are invited to discuss the difference resulting from biography vs history, but again the question does not ask them to focus on the relative merits of each, just how they contribute to clarity of presentation of the emperor’s character. It is likely that candidates will suggest that Suetonius gives a clearer picture because, as a biographer, he is more concerned with illustrating Nero’s character than what happened to and in Rome during his reign; but a candidate may equally argue for Tacitus, and as long as a reasonable argument is made with supporting evidence there is no reason to expect one approach to be more successful than the other. The most successful candidates are likely to be those that really focus on characterisation; plenty of illustrative incidents may be found in both authors.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9786	02

- (b) To what extent do scandalous tales about Nero distort our assessment of his achievements? Explain your answer with reference to your reading of Suetonius and Tacitus.

### Specific

Both Suetonius and Nero provide ample material for this question, with plenty of cruelty and lust to choose from; candidates should therefore be able to offer plenty of evidence. They are asked here to evaluate its reliability, and evaluation should focus on this. The suggested points steer them towards using the positive features of Nero's reign to assess this – do the scandals and the achievements reasonably seem like the actions of the same person, and if so, how far did they really impede his rule? Candidates may well argue that it is possible to be a good ruler with a scandalous private life, but there is ample evidence in the sources to demonstrate that the scandals did have an impact on effective rule, e.g. the readiness to believe Nero responsible for the fire and the scapegoating of Christians necessary as a result; and the good work of the rebuilding programme being undermined by the *domus aurea*.

Higher band answers are likely to underpin their evaluation of credibility with evidence from the sources that either strengthens or undermines the scandalous tales, and may also discuss authorial bias, e.g. Tacitus' senatorial background. Responses that catalogue tales of cruelty and lust without much in the way of evaluation of credibility or whether they prevented Nero from being a good emperor are likely to be limited to lower bands.



Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9786	02

## Roman architecture and building

### General

Although the nature of questioning for Paper 1 and 2 essays aims to guide candidates towards certain important areas to focus on in 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 as set (in the exam 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 constantly refresh their awareness of the question so as not to be carried away by the flow of an argument that 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.*

- 4 (a) **‘Roman buildings were more impressive on the inside than on the outside.’  
How far do you agree with this view?**

**[In your answer you might consider, among other things, the designs of specific buildings you have studied; a comparison of the materials and designs of their interiors and exteriors.]**

### **Specific**

The question is intended to invite a wide-ranging discussion of the designs of Roman buildings, comparing the exteriors and facades with the interiors (such as they survive or may be reconstructed from archaeology).

There is no restriction on the types of buildings chosen; obviously with some categories such as aqueducts and arches all or almost all of the focus is on the outside, not the inside; but in the cases of temples, such as the Pantheon, or public basilicas and monumental baths, it might be argued that more attention to detail and care in use of materials was expended on the inside, or in the creation of impressive spaces, than on the exteriors. An obvious example which might be included is the Pantheon, in which the marble inlay in the floors demonstrates considerable outlay of expense, and care over the design. Candidates might contrast this with the creation of a magnificent space (matched in the basilicas listed in the prescription - the Basilica of the Palace/*Aula Palatina* [Trier], the Basilica of Constantine and Maxentius [Rome and by public baths such as Hadrian’s Baths [Leptis Magna], the Forum Baths [Ostia], the Central Thermal Baths [Pompeii], the Baths of Caracalla [Rome], the Baths of Diocletian [Rome], the Baths of Trajan [Rome], the Imperial Baths [Trier].

Good answers will develop a supported argument with a clear conclusion, while weaker ones are likely to describe well, with less specific focus on the question and a conclusion which may be implicit rather than spelled out clearly.

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

<b>Page 10</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9786</b>	<b>02</b>

- (b) ‘Arches and concrete, but not much else.’ How fair a view is this of the most important features of Roman architecture?

**[In your answer you might consider, among other things, the use made by the Romans of arches and concrete; other materials and techniques which were used in Roman buildings; other aspects of Roman architecture.]**

### **Specific**

The question requires a discussion of whether Roman architecture has any qualities beyond the obvious ones of incorporating and exploiting the technological possibilities provided by the arch, vault and dome, resulting in vast concrete structures (such as the Golden Palace, baths of Diocletian and Caracalla, Hadrian’s Pantheon, and the massive harbour works at Ostia).

Stronger responses will discuss the introduction of these materials and techniques using appropriate technical vocabulary and with detailed accurate reference to well-chosen examples to illustrate the points made. They will move on to an evaluation of the issues raised by the question, developing supported judgements addressing whether these were the ‘real achievement’; this might include the artistic merits of Roman buildings (frequently omitted in discussion of them), the attempts at continuity with earlier (Greek) patterns, and the aims of achieving symmetry and elegance – arguably made more successful because of their use of the new materials and techniques.

Weaker responses may select a narrower range of examples (or unsuitable ones), perhaps describing techniques without any illustration, and in less detail; there may be less engagement with the terms of the question and more instances of unsupported assertions, or a one-sided approach which supports or criticizes the proposition without any real evaluative discussion. Whatever examples are chosen as support, the answer must contain a developed argument and justified conclusions based upon them.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9786	02

## Cicero and the fall of the republic

### General

Although the nature of questioning for Paper 1 and 2 essays aims to guide candidates towards certain important areas to focus on in 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 as set (in the exam 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 constantly refresh their awareness of the question so as not to be carried away by the flow of an argument that 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.*

- 5 (a) **‘Cicero’s failure to join the first triumvirate damaged his political career in the 50’s so seriously that it never really recovered.’**  
**How far do you agree with this assessment of Cicero’s political career in the period 59 – 50 BC?**

**[In answering this question you might consider, among other things, the Agrarian law; Caesar’s approaches to Cicero; the possibility of an alliance with Pompey; the results of exclusion from the triumvirate.]**

### **Specific**

This should be quite an accessible area for candidates to address. They might include discussion of how Cicero perceived his position following the ‘success’ of his consulship, Catiline and being named *‘pater patriae’*. It might also be noted that Cicero had, perhaps, an over-blown view of his own importance and influence in Rome and the Roman political scene. Another argument that might be advanced might be one of real political altruism in that he did not believe the *respublica* would be best served or preserved through furthering the progress of this alliance. Candidates should be able to recognise that there were overtures from the triumvirate and that Cicero may have considered them. It may also be that he preferred the option of some kind of alliance with Pompey in the hope that he might then win over Caesar (the subject of some correspondence with Atticus - which does have a rather altruistic or naïve ring to it). Similarly, he faced a dilemma with the proposals of the Agrarian law. (n.b. this whole area is dealt with thoroughly in ch.7 of Murrell’s book on Cicero and the Roman republic). One must not forget that the *bona dea* scandal is also mixed up with this at the time.

<b>Page 12</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9786</b>	<b>02</b>

Failure to join the triumvirate led to exile and the reality that, as he had probably been aware, executing Roman citizens without trial during his consulship would come back to haunt him. Although he was promised much support, he ended up going into exile which may well have led to depression. On his return, he appears to have been involved mainly in correspondence with Atticus and little political activity. The main area that he becomes involved in is the desire to get his property back on the Palatine, or at least the land because the house had been demolished and a temple to Liberty put up in its place by Clodius. In this period (the mid 50's) the only speech of note is the *pro Sestio* which was as much a pay-back for Sestius' support for his return from exile as a chance to make a political statement. Three main areas define Cicero in the late 50's – the lawcourts, literature and a lack of political independence although he remains a keen observer of the political scene in which he no longer participates. He is not really a free agent as he is forced to defend Gabinius at the insistence of Pompey and also, later, defends Milo. It is during this time that he writes his key political work – *de re publica*. (see ch. 8 of Murrell's book for an analysis of this period).

Page 13	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9786	02

- (b) 'To be politically successful Cicero had to stay in Rome.'  
To what extent is this view supported by Cicero's political career?

[In answering this question you might consider, among other things, his quaestorship at Lilybaeum; other provincial posts he held or gave up; the importance of Rome as the political centre; the need to appear in public.]

### Specific

This should provide a fertile area for candidates with a reasonable knowledge of the period. The stories of his quaestorship at Lilybaeum and how it was mis-remembered as he returned to Rome is well-known and should provide a good starting point for discussion. It is to be hoped that the guide points will lead candidates towards confirmation of this view. There is plenty of evidence to support the idea that Cicero felt he needed to be in the public eye and, particularly, as a 'new man', needed to be seen being successful in his own sphere – politics and the law courts – since he would not be gathering support from military successes as others did. That Cicero only ever reluctantly left Rome, either when obliged to through exile or because more powerful figures wanted him out of the way, goes a long way to showing how important being at the centre of affairs was. Candidates may note that when he was away from Rome on official business he carried out that business well (there may also be the inevitable mentions of Caelius' requests for animals for his games). He was even prepared to trade his consular province for a bigger say in affairs during his consulship. There can be little doubt that Rome was the centre of politics and that if one had to rely on personality and alliances, not backed up by military force or vast sums of money, being there was essential. It is to be hoped that candidates will find it relatively easy to draw on material to support the main thrust of the question and illustrate it effectively from Cicero's own works.

Page 14	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9786	02

## Urban archaeology of the Roman Near East

### General

Although the nature of questioning for Paper 1 and 2 essays aims to guide candidates towards certain important areas to focus on in 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 as set (in the exam 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 constantly refresh their awareness of the question so as not to be carried away by the flow of an argument that 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.*

- 6 (a) **To what extent is it possible to reconstruct gender roles from the urban archaeology of the Roman Near East? Explain your answer.**

**[In answering this question you might consider, among other things, evidence for ritual and religion; evidence for social organisation; inscriptions and art; small finds.]**

### **Specific**

We might expect a discussion of male and female roles in urban society with evidence being drawn from archaeology supported by historical sources and inscriptions. Typical areas for discussion might be religion and ritual, economics and political life. Candidates might also recognise that gender roles varied depending on social status. There might also be a discussion of evidence for gender specialisation in certain area of urban society. Better scripts will discuss the strengths and limitations of archaeology in determining gender roles in ancient societies.

The different roles of men and women in religion and ritual might be a valuable area for discussion. All of the named sites in the syllabus have cult centres which were dominated by one or other sex, for example the cult of Cybele in Ephesus.

Linked to this is an analysis of mortuary practice and – potentially – gender differentiation of individuals after death. This would be a good area for the discussion of the impact of social status of the methods of disposal of the dead with special reference to gender.

Gender and economics is a more difficult area to discuss. In Palmyra there is evidence for key roles being played by females in a domestic textiles industry. In other areas of economic activity inscription evidence can shed light on gender roles, but pure archaeological techniques are less effective at achieving this goal.

The excavation of structures and an analysis of small finds might engender a discussion of the function of dwellings along gender lines. Candidates might discuss the delineation of space within structures along gender lines.

<b>Page 15</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9786</b>	<b>02</b>

Virtually all of the case studies in the specification had political systems dominated by males. The only exceptions to this would be potentially key roles played by female ritual specialists in relation to politics and Palmyra. There is an argument that women played a key role in the politics of Palmyra – witness queen Zenobia. There is also academic debate about the nature of marriage in this city.

- (b) To what extent can archaeology inform us about of the religious beliefs and ritual practices of the populations of cities in the Roman Near East? Explain your answer.**

**[In answering this question you might consider, among other things, ritual structures; art; mortuary practice; inscriptions and small finds.]**

### **Specific**

Responses will probably discuss the physical remains associated with religion and ritual in the form of religious sites and art – especially sculpture associated with worship. This evaluation might be supported by written sources and inscription evidence to create a model of religious and ritual practice in the cities that form the case studies of the syllabus. Better responses will apply archaeological techniques to an analysis of religion and ritual, the form of sites, the existence of ritual specialists and the like. Candidates might discuss the integration of multiple cults into the religious life of the cities and the acceptance of religious beliefs from outside mainstream Greek and Roman culture. No set response is expected. All of the sites have evidence for many religious beliefs existing alongside one another.

Aphrodisias might be discussed as a cult centre of Aphrodite, the temple to this goddess is both extensive and played an important religious function on an empire wide level. This structure could be compared to the worship of Artemis at Ephesus. There is also the ‘Sebastion’, a cult centre to Augustus allowing a discussion of the role of the imperial cult in civic life and potentially a comparison with the other case studies in the specification.

Ephesus is similar to Aphrodisias as a significant cult centre to Artemis with the famous temple complex located at the site. A discussion of the worship of this deity and the cultural integration of the Anatolian deity Cybele into worship within the city would be a useful area for discussion. There is also potential for a discussion of the establishment and growth of a Christian community in the city.

Miletos has a temple to the eastern god Serapis alongside cult centres one might associate with a city within mainstream Greek culture. Pergamum also has a temple to Serapis and an important cult centre to Asclepius with an associated healing spa with extensive supporting buildings for the worship of this deity.

Palmyra is perhaps the most ‘alien’ of the five case studies with its oriental origins and associated religious practices. The temple of Bel and its associated structures would form the basis of a good discussion of religious diversity within the Roman east and the integration of oriental religious practices.