

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2012 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 2012 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 2012	9786	02

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

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

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9786	01

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 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) To what extent was Augustus' power based solely on brute force?

[In answering this question you might consider, among other things, Augustus' relationship with the army and the Praetorian Guard; assassinations and exiles during his reign; Augustus' constitutional position; propaganda.]

Specific

Candidates will have to be clear about what they mean by power. They might deal with the matter by discussing what Augustus was able to do, what he was not, and what restraints he experienced.

Brute force was supplied in Rome by the Praetorian Guard and in the provinces by the army. It would probably be sensible to deal with each in turn. Candidates might like to deal with Augustus' reign chronologically. There seems little doubt that he came to power by the use of brute force, finally well marshalled by Agrippa. And throughout his reign there was always the threat that he had the Praetorian Guard and the legions, both of which were loyal to him personally. It is also true that various opponents were exiled or assassinated (e.g. Agrippa Postumus). On the other hand, there does not seem to be – during the reign itself – the number of political assassinations that we associate with, say, Tiberius or Claudius. Indeed, in his dealings with the senate, it could be argued that Augustus was keen not to use brute force (hence the settlements of 27 and 23BC). His attempts to ensure the succession were also thwarted on a number of occasions, so it might be argued that even if his power rested on (the threat of) brute force, that was not always effective. Some consideration of Augustus' use of propaganda (poetry, *Res Gestae*, architecture and sculpture) would also help to qualify the statement in the question.

Relevant and accurate use of sources is a requirement for high marks.

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9786	01

(b) How effective was the administration of the empire under Augustus?

[In answering this question you might consider, among other things, Augustus' use of *equites* in key positions; the division between imperial and senatorial provinces; the development of the imperial cult.]

Specific

The candidates must deal with 'effectiveness': some definition is likely to be required. They should also consider to what extent the administration of the empire was designed to serve Rome and politics in Rome (e.g. the importance of food supply and the province of Egypt).

On the administration of empire, candidates should look to the speed with which Augustus reorganises the empire after the battle of Actium: the reduction in the number of legions; the appointment of an equestrian prefect to administer Egypt; the establishment of his proconsular imperium and the *legati Augusti*. The slippery quality of the distinction between senatorial and imperial provinces should be discussed (and, in particular, the problems of 23BC). It might be a good idea to investigate the importance of the imperial cult and any evidence dealing with the views of provincials.

Candidates would be expected to make use of Suetonius, Tacitus and the *Res Gestae*, as well as any relevant epigraphical evidence.

Ovid's *Metamorphoses*

2 (a) From the books of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* you have read, how far do you agree that they contain few stories suitable for children?

[In answering this question you might consider, among other things, a range of characters, storylines and themes; Ovid's narrative techniques.]

Specific

This question asks candidates to evaluate Ovid's narrative.

As part of our classical heritage, many stories appear in mythological tales in children's books. However, quite often they are adapted. Candidates are expected to have read Book 1, so mention could be made of creation, giants and the flood. There are many other endearing characters – such as Baucis and Philemon (Book 8) – described in a humorous way. Many candidates may have been introduced to the classical world through the myths of Ovid.

A closer study of the *Metamorphoses* reveals violence. Ovid narrates the demise of his characters with graphic details, e.g. Lycaon's metamorphosis in Book 1:

His ravening soul infected his jaws; his murderous longings were turned on the cattle; he was still possessed by bloodlust.

The story of Acteon (Book 3) may be regarded in a similar way. There are also stories of murder (Daedalus and Perdix) and suicide (Ajax).

More adult themes appear, such as homoeroticism in the story of Echo and Narcissus. There are also sexual undertones in other stories, such as Orpheus and Eurydice. Ovid included these in his narrative with due consideration. There are also stories based on treachery (such as Laomedon in Book 11). Candidates may evaluate whether stories intended to be read as a whole work should be selected and possibly viewed out of context.

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9786	01

Some stories are very long with dialogue and detailed descriptions. Candidates may not find the stories in Book 15 as exciting as the earlier myths. Ovid thought these accounts important to bring a unity to his whole work.

Candidates must be able to argue a case and justify any assertions that they make; an answer consisting of a list of stories with summary judgements on the suitability of each is likely not to reach the higher levels of marks.

(b) How important is emotion in the books of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* you have read?

[In answering this question you might consider, among other things, a range of emotions shown by different characters; how emotion is used in Ovid's narrative; the emotional impact on the reader.]

Specific

This question asks candidates to evaluate Ovid's treatment of emotion. Book 1 is a compulsory text so there are no set examples to be expected from the rest of the poem. However, discussion of a range of myths and characters from *different* books *is* to be expected, as is some analysis of what the candidate understands by a range of emotions: these may include emotions shown by characters, such as love, fear and anger, as well as the emotional pull on the audience/reader (e.g. pathos).

A partially satisfactory answer might be made from listing emotions. Candidates will probably consider the love between husband and wife (e.g. Deucalion and Pyrrha). Better answers may address other related emotions beyond specific characters. Some evaluation of the importance of emotions should be expected from better answers. The strong feelings are often motives for the actions of the characters and the subsequent metamorphosis – such as in the episode of Apollo and Daphne.

Some may find the emotions displayed in the stories too overpowering or schmaltzy, such as Ceyx and Alcyone. The more historic stories may have greater appeal. Some appeal may be found in the battle descriptions or the more graphic details.

Whatever candidates decide, their answer must argue a case and justify the assertions made.

Nero as seen through the eyes of Suetonius and Tacitus

3 (a) 'Had his principal interest not been his own pleasure and self-indulgence, Nero had it in him to be one of the better emperors.' How far do you agree with this opinion?

[In your answer you might consider, among other things, Nero's pursuit of pleasure; positive aspects of his reign; the balance between these elements in the accounts you have read.]

Specific

This question invites the candidate to do two things: firstly, to assess the positive and negative aspects of Nero's reign; secondly, to assess whether the negative can be attributed to his pursuit of his own personal pleasures. Weaker candidates are likely to concentrate almost entirely on the former, while stronger candidates may examine the implicit premise in the question, that it was Nero's self-indulgence that stopped him being a good emperor. Weaker candidates may rely on presenting a 'factual' account of Nero's reign to support their argument, while stronger ones will acknowledge that one must account for any prejudice or

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9786	01

agenda in the set authors. At any rate, arguments must be supported by evidence from both authors; stronger candidates may examine discrepancies or differences in emphasis between the two authors.

Evidence for Nero's potential as a good emperor would most likely include an account of the *quinquennium Neronis* and his rebuilding of Rome after the fire, including legislation he introduced; there are other examples in both authors of good leadership. The basic structure of Suetonius' biography, with its broad division into good followed by bad, should allow weaker candidates a way in to this answer, so examples should not be scarce. Certainly examples of self-indulgent behaviour are not in short supply, and will include his charioteering and singing, as well as the *domus aurea* and such incidents as the party on Agrippa's reservoir, his sexual indiscretions, etc. Stronger candidates may well observe, though, that not all Nero's reprehensible actions were due to hedonism, for example, the murder of Agrippina; their answers are likely to observe a more complex character, often driven by fear and anxiety as much as selfishness.

Candidates may observe the influence of 'good' advisors, such as Seneca and Burrus, in different ways, some criticising the need for such advice to keep him on the straight and narrow, others crediting his ability to be influenced positively. Equally, candidates may respond to their counterparts, Tigellinus and Agrippina, as inevitably corrupting Nero or as simply a sign of his potential to be corrupted.

- (b) **'Nero is so easy a target for hatred and ridicule that it is difficult to find reliable sources for his reign.' Is this a reasonable criticism of the accounts of Tacitus and Suetonius?**

[In your answer you might consider, among other things, evidence for hatred and ridicule in each author; how using these authors as evidence might not give a fair impression of Nero's reign; how reasonable the attitudes of the authors might be given the behaviour they describe.]

Specific

This question may result in weaker candidates simply rehearsing incidents which invite hatred and ridicule of Nero; some may develop this by giving details of more positive aspects, and suggest that such a reaction may not be entirely fair. But the question explicitly asks the candidates to assess the reliability of Suetonius' and Tacitus' accounts. To access higher bands candidates must consistently refer to the opinions expressed or invited by the authors, whether explicit or implicit, and address how this might influence the reader, as well as any agenda the author may have which might lead to a distortion of the evidence.

The best candidates ought to be able to demonstrate clearly how the authors attempt to exert this influence, for example, through Tacitus' arrangement of material, sometimes even changing the chronology, or Suetonius' division of his biography into broadly 'good' then 'bad' details. The very best candidates may then defend the authors as simply practising the art of literary historiography or biography as was expected at the time, and suggest that any distortion may be down to our different expectations; for example, Tacitus' re-arrangement of material groups events to give a version that is not strictly accurate, but gives a greater impression of the true nature of Nero's reign, while Suetonius observes a form common to biography.

Good candidates ought to display a judgement of the text based on familiarity not only with incident but with how those incidents are portrayed, and an awareness that the authors' accounts require a discretionary response from the reader, and are not intended as factual records. Nero's reign is not short of examples of behaviour that makes him a target for hatred

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9786	01

or ridicule; while counterpoints to this might be desirable, it ought to be possible to achieve all but the highest band by giving a reasonable critique of the author's presentation of the sort of behaviour mentioned in the question.

Finally, candidates must address both aspects, hatred and ridicule, if not in equal measure, at least with more than a glance at one or other; those not treating either side of the question suitably are not fully meeting AO1.

Roman architecture and building

- 4 (a) **'The sheer scale of many Roman construction projects overshadows any sense of balance or proportion in Roman architecture.'** How far do you agree with this view?

[In your answer you might consider, among other things, specific examples of bath-houses, amphitheatres and circuses; the quality and features of their design.]

Specific

The question requires a detailed treatment of an adequate range of specific large-scale buildings used to support a reasoned conclusion related to the title. The Coliseum or Circus Maximus and the Baths of Caracalla or Diocletian are obvious examples from Rome, though discussion of any buildings other than those set for discussion in the Near East module should be given appropriate credit.

This is to some extent an 'open' question, though credit should be given for any discussion of proportion and balance/harmony drawn from and related to the buildings themselves, and also drawn from writers, of whom the most likely to appear will be Vitruvius. The baths/amphitheatres/circuses themselves may be used as the basis for all discussion of the concepts of 'balance and proportion', or they may be compared and contrasted with other types and styles of buildings such as temples – that is, a conclusion about *relative* emphases on balance and harmony in different types of buildings may be reached. Such approaches are equally valid in terms of the question.

At the highest levels of response there will be a thorough engagement with the issues raised in the question and an appreciation (which may be personal and not shared by the examiner – but credit it if it is supported and argued!). Weaker responses may select a narrower range of examples (or unsuitable ones), perhaps describing buildings with little discussion or argument developed, and in less detail. There may be less engagement with issues raised by 'balance or proportion' and unsupported assertions, or a one-sided approach which supports or criticises the proposition without any real evaluative discussion.

- (b) **'The design of Roman religious buildings and monuments was totally dominated by traditional views of what architectural styles were appropriate for such buildings.'** To what extent do the buildings which you have studied support this view?

[In your answer you might consider, among other things, a range of religious buildings constructed in Rome or in the provinces; the variety of architectural styles and building techniques embodied in them.]

Specific

The question asks for discussion of religious buildings – the obvious choices being temples – but allow use of other constructions with a primarily religious function, such as tombs (e.g. mausoleum of Augustus or Hadrian.) *Traditional* styles should be discussed and defined for evaluation to take place, and this may include Greek influence and the development of the

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9786	01

Corinthian style, illustrated by numerous temples in Rome and in the provinces. Reward awareness of developments from the Greek examples and developments in such examples as the *Maison Carrée* at Nimes, and (perhaps the most obvious example) the Pantheon which embodies new concepts in its main structure but which has more than a passing debt to 'traditional' styles' in its façade and porch.

Reward discussion which explores links to the traditional and developments in terms of aesthetics (design) or in choice of materials; likewise give appropriate credit for reference to literary evidence from Vitruvius (and perhaps some examples from Pliny the Elder), though detailed knowledge and discussion of surviving examples is likely to form the body of responses.

Weaker answers may select a narrower range of examples (or unsuitable ones), perhaps describing 'traditional views of architectural styles' without any illustration, and in less detail. There may be less engagement with issues raised by 'real achievement' and unsupported assertions, or a one-sided approach which supports or criticises 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.

Cicero and the fall of the republic

- 5 (a) 'Cicero's prosecution of Verres played a major part in defining his political career.' How far do you agree with this assessment?

[In answering this question you might consider, among other things, his early career; the political implications of undertaking the prosecution of Verres; the results of the trial and the advantages they may have offered Cicero.]

Specific

It is to be hoped that candidates may refer to Cicero's time as *quaestor* at Lilybaeum and the story from the *pro Plancio* of his return, illustrating that people had little knowledge of the activities of those sent away from Rome on public duties which confirmed Cicero in his belief that 'out of sight was out of mind'. He never voluntarily left Rome and the 'political centre' again. The only times he was out of Rome were during his governorship of Cilicia, his exile and the Civil War of 49-47 B.C., none of which he could have avoided. Candidates may also wish to refer to his governorship of Cilicia being a 'model' of good conduct (Caelius and the beasts for his show, for example).

Candidates should refer to the corruption of Verres' governorship which was known at the time. There are plenty of examples of this (usually from Cicero himself). Candidates may also note that Verres was not necessarily all bad. Sallust mentions that he strengthened the coastline close to Italy. Cicero was seen, following his quaestorship, as an honest broker by the Sicilians.

In taking on the prosecution, Cicero makes a stand against the Sullan party which rallied round Verres, including the judge at the trial. In facing Hortensius in court, Cicero is also seeking to establish/confirm his position as the leading advocate in Rome. (See also Cicero and Erucius in the *pro Roscio Amerino* at the beginning of his career.) Candidates may also note that Cicero tended to defend rather than prosecute.

Verres went into voluntary exile in Massilia, a tacit admission of guilt and impending conviction, so the *actio secunda* was never delivered. Success enabled Cicero to enhance

Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9786	01

his reputation, build an external power base and show how seriously he took his task by collecting evidence assiduously in Sicily. His elevation to the *aedileship* in 69 BC was pretty much concurrent with the prosecution.

- (b) **Why was the first triumvirate formed? To what extent did its actions make Cicero's exile inevitable?**

[In answering this question you might consider, among other things, the reasons for the formation of the triumvirate; Cicero's chronicling of the period 61–58 BC; the options facing Cicero and his subsequent exile.]

Specific

Candidates should find it relatively straightforward to address the first part of the question, giving reasons for the formation of the first triumvirate and then how they were prepared to work outside the usual channels to achieve their aims. Candidates may also note the antagonistic stance taken by many members of the Senate.

Cicero chronicles the period extensively, particularly in his letters to Atticus. (This material is readily available in any of the books that students may use for study.) It is one of the most fascinating accounts that we have of the period from which much information may be derived about the politics and the subversive attempts of individuals. Candidates may query whether this was little more than self-seeking on either side.

That Cicero was courted by the triumvirate is undeniable. Whether he refused their offers through some form of political conscience, egotism, a desire to resurrect the *concordia ordinum* or through a desire never to leave Rome voluntarily again is less clear. The end result of this refusal to become attached to the triumvirate led to his exile in 58–57 BC and the temporary triumph of his enemy, Clodius.

Urban archaeology of the Roman Near East

- 6 (a) **To what extent did the cities of the Roman Near East function as manufacturing centres? Explain your answer.**

[In answering this question you might consider, among other things, evidence for metallurgy, textiles and pottery production; the use of, and origins of, the raw materials for manufacturing; evidence for manufacturing facilities.]

Specific

The question asks candidates to consider the economic function of cities in the Roman Near East over time. Better answers will link archaeological methods with the physical evidence and attempt to model the manufacturing economy of cities. Ancient literature may be used as evidence to support the archaeology but it cannot drive the debate. Better responses will evaluate such evidence in relation to the archaeology. Inscription evidence is very valid.

A partially satisfactory answer might be highly descriptive and might find it difficult to interweave the different aspects of the response to produce a fully integrated argument.

Evidence can be drawn from an archaeological analysis of one or more cities. Manufacturing evidence might be drawn from sites where the production of pottery, textiles or metalwork is evident, but examiners need to be aware of the broad range of potential sources to support debate. Resource exploitation and the movement from sites of origin to production centres is a very valid area of debate. The methods of manufacturing employed and the final products

Page 10	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9786	01

in the form of small finds are valid areas for discussion, as is the movement via trade. Candidates should be aware of the limitations of some of the evidence such as the rare finds of textiles.

Better responses will be able to integrate the archaeology into a broader analysis of the use of archaeology in the modelling of ancient economic activity. Further, a better response might discuss the role of monopolies and different types of economic exchange.

- (b) How did the cities of the Roman Near East function as centres both for local and imperial administration? Explain your answer.**

[In answering this question you might consider, among other things, the function and design of buildings; evidence for an administrative class; the relationship between the city and its surrounding territory; inscriptional evidence.]

Specific

The concept of a territory should be understood and the position of the cities chosen as evidence. The cities should be discussed as regional administrative centres often with a native tradition that pre-dates the Roman conquest of the region. Cities should also be viewed as part of a larger imperial system of administration. Administration might be defined in several ways but an obvious three-tiered approach of justice, taxation and administration might be expected.

Evidence for administration might be found in the design and positioning of public buildings. Governmental structures might include basilica, forum, agora and palaces. The function and outcome of administration might be addressed, for example, the ability to successfully tax a region. Inscriptional evidence is very appropriate to the discussion. Ancient literature is valid evidence but its limitations should be discussed and certainly this type of evidence cannot dominate the response.