

Classics: Classical Civilisation

Advanced GCE F387

Unit CC7: Roman Britain: life in the outpost of the Empire

Mark Scheme for June 2010

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2010

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

Section A		
Question Number	Answer	Marks
	Answers must be marked using the level descriptors in the marking grids and a mark awarded for each Assessment Objective. The following points are indicative and offer question specific guidance. They do not provide an exhaustive list and any relevant points should be credited.	
1	Study the picture and answer the questions. The 'Venus mosaic' from the villa at Rudston.	
(a)	<p>How typical of artistic representations of Roman gods and goddesses found in Roman Britain is the 'Rudston Venus'? In your answer you should refer to <u>at least three</u> other representations of Roman gods and goddesses found in Roman Britain.</p> <p>Reward evaluation of the source illustrated with detailed treatment rewarded as appropriate in line with the marking grids; credit use made of other sources which should be 'artistic representations of gods and goddesses' in this part of the answer. From prescribed examples, these might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Venus sculpted relief from High Rochester (direct comparison); • Mercury, Uley; • Antenociticus, Benwell; • Cocidius, Bewcastle. <p>Or any other accurately cited and relevant examples, whether from mosaics, sculpture, or any other art form.</p> <p>Allow Roman emperors eg the head of Claudius/Hinton St Mary Christ-figure). Discussion of material chosen should lead to an evaluated response and a clear and supported conclusion at the highest level focused specifically on 'typical'; allow arguments either way provided that there is appropriate support for judgements made.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">[AO1 =10 + AO2 =15 = 25 marks]</p>	[25]
(b)	<p>How far do you agree that distinctive Romano-British styles of art emerged during the Roman occupation of Britain?</p> <p>Credit answers which evaluate a number of examples carefully: there is limited discussion (much disputed in some quarters!) in Hill & Ireland chapter 8, especially on Aurelia Aureliana, p.109; see more detailed treatment by Huskinson in Salway, pp. 137-8. Whichever side of the argument the discussion sets forth, there should be a clear appreciation of what constituted 'Roman' or 'British/Celtic' styles to base the argument on and a detailed discussion of them. Credit any relevant examples from Celtic and Roman types (eg Battersea Shield, head of Claudius – and any artistic form be it wall-painting, mosaic, or plastic art/sculpture/relief carvings on tombstones, for example.) The key evaluation must be on whether or not a 'distinctive RB style' can be identified. At the highest levels there should be a clear judgement about how far the available evidence supports the idea or not: answers which show an appreciation of ambiguities in interpreting 'British' (as opposed to 'continental Celtic' or 'Germanic') styles, and which demonstrate the contemporary co-existence of a number of styles within Britain, should also be well rewarded. Well-detailed and supported answers may highlight differences between low- and high-status artefacts, or question whether some artefacts demonstrate deliberate, skilful execution</p>	[25]

	or are poor pastiche which were nevertheless presumably acceptable to their owners (eg the Rudston Venus, illustrated, which may be contrasted with arguably better images in the same location). Answers which raise in addition the limitations of extant material (eg only some media survive – leather, wood, textiles, prone to decay) and who use these ideas critically in building an argument and reaching a conclusion should be credited appropriately.	
	[AO1 = 10 + AO2 = 15 = 25 marks]	
	Section A Total	[50]

Section A		
Question Number	Answer	Marks
	Answers must be marked using the level descriptors in the marking grids and a mark awarded for each Assessment Objective. The following points are indicative and offer question specific guidance. They do not provide an exhaustive list and any relevant points should be credited.	
2	Study the inscriptions below and answer the questions. LACTOR 4, <i>Inscriptions of Roman Britain</i> , 260, 262, 264.	
(a)	<p>How useful are these inscriptions in illustrating the spread of ‘foreign cults’ in Roman Britain’?</p> <p>Reward detailed treatment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> location – two on securely identifiable military sites, Carrawburgh on Hadrian’s Wall, Chester; the second one on a possibly military site, Londonium; the geographic ‘spread’ should be credited where noted; dating – (i) unknown, (ii) 3rd century, but then apparently abandoned (under Christian influence?) (iii) 3rd century – temporal ‘spread’ is shown, with both growth (and in the case of (ii), decline); persons carrying out the inscriptions; (i) a civilian, probably a migrant to Britain, perhaps associated with the army; (ii) a governor – senatorial rank – who favours Isis; (iii) military commander of a cohort – these are all limited to the higher status, military and governmental levels of Romano-British society – the evidence for ‘spread’ here is decidedly limited; the five foreign deities mentioned, explained from own knowledge – these are the sole mentions of each in the examples in LACTOR 4 – again, ‘limited’ spread may be argued for on this basis, though some candidates may mention the jug inscribed ‘London: at the temple of Isis’, making two pieces of evidence (see comment below on limitations of the evidence overall). <p>Answers may note that the second inscription, while recalling the rebuilding of a temple to Isis, later found itself re-used in fortifications – Isis no longer worshipped?</p> <p>Reward all evaluated comment which is based on these inscriptions and related to the topic, and in addition any other material which may be cited in order to place these in a context; this other evidence may include inscriptions on manufactured items, epigraphic records recording individuals with a religious aspect (funerary monuments, votive offerings, official inscriptions which include mention of the imperial cult or the <i>genius</i> of individuals), curse tablets and so on. Some candidates’ answers will discuss them critically to support a balanced judgement.</p> <p>Credit answers which also explore the <i>limitations</i> of epigraphic evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> in terms of the amount which survives/may survive; the limited sections of society who made use of it – expensive inscriptions on stone are likely to be the result of only a small segment of society. 	[25]
	[AO1 = 10 + AO2 = 15 = 25 marks]	

Section A		
Question Number	Answer	Marks
(b)	<p>How far does other available evidence support the view that ‘foreign cults’ became widely practised in Roman Britain?</p> <p>At the highest level there should be a range of accurate information to support an answer: refer closely to the grids. ‘Foreign cults’ need to be defined (the wording in the question is taken directly from the specification) but most answers will probably assume it means ‘foreign to traditional Rome and Britain’ i.e. perhaps picking up on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Isis – the example cited here, and the London jug inscribed ‘by the temple of Isis’; • Astarte (LACTOR 4.261) found at Coria/Corbridge; • Dolichenus, also found at Coria/Corbridge (LACTOR 4.263); • Mithras – the example shown, plus London Mithraeum and sculpture associated with veteran of leg. II Augusta; • reward any mention of Christianity, - the Mosaic at Hinton St Mary may have Christian associations; Lullingstone wall-paintings likewise, allow any use of Germanic deities (LACTOR 4.228, <i>Mars Alator</i>, 229, <i>Mars Belatucadrus</i>; 234, <i>Mars Thincsus</i>). <p>In addition, reward any alternative approaches which see the question as an invitation to discuss cults ‘foreign’ to Celtic (non-Romanised) Britain – which would then permit the discussion of emperor-worship, the traditional Roman pantheon, and so on. Provided that it is clear within the essay that the candidate understands the concept of ‘foreign cults’ and provides good detailed support for conclusions, either approach must be allowed.</p> <p>In particular, credit evaluated archaeological source material (eg Sulis-Minerva complex at Bath or Uley – Mercury) which appears to suggest that much of RB society did <i>not</i> practise ‘foreign cults’, and reward support for continuing Celtic cult practices. In addition, answers may explore literary evidence such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tacitus and Dio - imperial cult at Colchester/Camulodunum; • literary records about British bishops at the council of Arles; • the existence of later British Christian writers such as Pelagius and Patrick. <p>Strong responses will give a clear supported response to the term <i>widely practised</i>, with appropriately detailed support. Credit should also be given to answers which stress the inherent limitations of the available evidence – literary evidence is likely to be ‘skewed’ from a Roman perspective, while archaeology is limited to the higher strata of society so far as we can tell, and what happened in rural areas is largely unrecorded. Answers might question what actual changes there were in widespread religious cult at the lowest levels (ie in the bulk of the population) and whether this was the same throughout the province. Reward discussion of possible contrasts between urban/rural, high status/low status, and military/civilian contexts.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">[AO1 = 10 + AO2 = 15 = 25 marks]</p>	[25]
Section A Total		[50]

Section B		
Question Number	Answer	Marks
	Answers must be marked using the level descriptors in the marking grids and a mark awarded for each Assessment Objective. The following points are indicative and offer question specific guidance. They do not provide an exhaustive list and any relevant points should be credited.	
3	<p>How important were roads to the economic development of Roman Britain?</p> <p>For marks in the highest bands there should be detailed information on the scope and scale of the Roman road network, with specific examples of their importance as far as economic functions were concerned. These might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • military supply; • travel; • trade within regions (eg location of villas to urban markets); • opening up the country to imports and for exports; • widening of trade in luxury goods – pedlars travelling eg to Hadrian’s Wall area; • development of agriculture using the villa system – large estates; • development of wider markets for local industries, eg Black Burnished Ware and Alice Holt potteries. <p>Answers may also question what would have happened without roads, a network linking the empire.</p> <p>Credit answers which evaluate a number of examples carefully: there is obviously scope for marks to be earned by specific reference to known road systems, but also from documentary sources including itineraries and inscriptions from the roads themselves (mileposts, the inscription to the ‘god who invented roads’), as well as local records of trade (Vindolanda, for example, which provides information not only on the usefulness but also the limitations of roads, bad in winter/danger to oxen). Candidates may consider limitations of road transport (speed/cost of using ox-drawn wagons) and discuss the alternatives open to the Romans (sea/Classis Britannica, canals) which limit the ‘importance of roads’ somewhat.</p> <p>Candidates may also note the differentiation in types of economic development: small metalwork / pottery / bulk grain for example. They may also note <i>secondary</i> development eg roads → imperial post → <i>mansiones</i> → pressure on / opportunities for leatherworking / blacksmithing / arable and livestock farming.</p> <p>Reward in line with the mark grids according to the range of examples cited and depth of interpretation – including approaches which offer multiple interpretations, or provide a critical assessment of the limits of available information. The key word is ‘important’. More successful answers will offer a clear judgement about the ways and extent to which roads were effective on the economy, enabling increased trade and ensuring rapid communication, probably within a clear chronological context, and supported with accurate and well-evaluated detail.</p>	[50]
	[AO1 = 20 + AO2 = 30 = 50 marks]	

Section B		
Question Number	Answer	Marks
	Answers must be marked using the level descriptors in the marking grids and a mark awarded for each Assessment Objective. The following points are indicative and offer question specific guidance. They do not provide an exhaustive list and any relevant points should be credited.	
4	<p>To what extent did the development of towns contribute to the Romanisation of Britain?</p> <p>Look for well-developed answers which incorporate and deploy a wide range of examples cited accurately and used in support of a discussion on 'Romanisation'. Answers may include information drawn from the whole period of the Roman occupation, and may cite a variety of reasons why towns developed before going on to a discussion of their effect on the 'Romanisation' of the province. For example, some towns were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • developed from former military sites – eg Isca/Exeter, Viroconium/Wroxeter; • 'imposed' as colonies, eg Camulodunum/Colchester, Glevum/Gloucester, Lindum/Lincoln, possibly York/Eboracum (later in the period when it was already established); • developed because of economic growth and then became the 'natural focus' of the central administration – Londinium/London; • grew up because of some passing trade – any <i>mansiones</i> may be cited; • developed alongside military forts – <i>vici</i> or <i>cannabae</i> – eg Vindolanda, Housesteads – any are relevant; • were 'imposed' as new <i>civitas capitales</i> – for example Silchester, Winchester, Cirencester, Caerwent. <p>The strongest responses will contain more detailed discussion and should be based on a range of sites, and in support of their impact of 'Romanisation' may discuss functions which those towns performed (administrative/economic/supporting garrisons/<i>coloniae</i> and so on) and exploring characteristics of 'town life', such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • centralized trade; • local manufacturing; • 'Roman' aspects, such as the use of statues, inscriptions, domestic buildings; • municipal government; • specifically 'Roman' public buildings such as bath-houses, basilicas, temples, and theatres. <p>Accept accounts which go beyond AD 415 in illustrating the total decline of some urban centres (eg Silchester, Verulamium – theatre became a rubbish-dump) and possible continuity in others (eg Wroxeter, Carlisle) which has an impact on discussion of 'Romanisation'. Reward epigraphic support and the obvious illustration from Tacitus <i>Agricola</i> 21 on Romanisation.</p> <p>The key criteria to be explored are that of development and Romanisation – the strongest responses may include a clear definition of this latter term. Both should be addressed - perhaps not equally – for the highest marks.</p>	[50]

Section B		
Question Number	Answer	Marks
	<p>Discussion of development and Romanisation may be supported by noting the earliest changes from native oppida and centres of monarchy in the south and east to Romanised towns (eg Camulodunum, Verulamium) to the development of more widespread urban life through colonia and following the army; evidence for veterans involved in urban culture from inscriptions should be credited.</p> <p>Equally, reward discussion which explores the idea that Roman towns did <i>not</i> contribute greatly to Romanising the province; other factors such as the military presence, or villas in rural areas, may be adduced; or it may be argued (as with Mattingly and others recently) that much of the province remained untouched, or that Romanisation was largely unwanted and the natives shook off the trappings of Rome when they were able to. Explanations of changes in function in towns which effect this discussion, including the move out of towns into villas in the later period, should be credited where these are supported by accurate detail and sources.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">[AO1 = 20 + AO2 = 30 = 50 marks]</p>	
Section B Total		[50]

A2 Classics Marking Grid for units CC7–CC10: AO1

<i>Recall and deploy relevant knowledge and understanding of literary, cultural, material or historical sources or linguistic forms, in their appropriate contexts</i>	<i>Max. mark and mark ranges</i>		<i>Characteristics of performance</i>
	10	20	
Level 5	9–10	18–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recall and application of subject knowledge; • Relevance to question/topic; • Understanding of sources and evidence; • Awareness of context. • A very good collection/range of detailed factual knowledge; • Fully relevant to the question; • Well-supported with evidence and reference where required; • Displays a very good understanding/awareness of context, as appropriate.
Level 4	7–8	14–17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A good collection/range of detailed factual knowledge; • Mostly relevant to the question; • Mostly supported with evidence and reference where required; • Displays a good understanding/awareness of context, as appropriate.
Level 3	5–6	9–13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A collection/range of basic factual knowledge; • Partially relevant to the question; • Partially supported with evidence and reference where required; • Displays some understanding/awareness of context, as appropriate.
Level 2	2–4	5–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited factual knowledge; • Occasionally relevant to the question; • Occasionally supported with evidence; • Displays limited understanding/awareness of context, as appropriate.
Level 1	0–1	0–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no factual knowledge; • Rarely relevant to the question; • Minimal or no supporting evidence; • Displays minimal or no understanding/awareness of context, as appropriate.

A2 Classics Marking Grid for units CC7–CC10: AO2 (a and b)

	<i>Max. mark and mark ranges</i>		Characteristics of performance
	15	30	
(a) Analyse, evaluate and respond to classical sources (literary, cultural, material, historical or linguistic), as appropriate			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis; • Evaluation and response; • Organisation and use of technical vocabulary; • Control of appropriate form and style; • Accuracy of writing.
(b) Select, organise and present relevant information and argument in a clear, logical, accurate and appropriate form			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thorough analysis of evidence/issues; • Perceptive evaluation with very thoughtful engagement with sources/task; • Very well structured response with clear and developed argument; • Fluent and very effective communication of ideas; • Very accurately written with effective use of specialist vocabulary/terms.
Level 5	14–15	26–30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good analysis of evidence/issues; • Sound evaluation with thoughtful engagement with sources/task; • Well structured response with clear argument; • Mostly fluent and effective communication of ideas; • Accurately written with use of specialist vocabulary/terms.
Level 4	10–13	20–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some analysis of evidence/issues; • Some evaluation with some engagement with sources/task; • Structured response with some underdeveloped argument; • Generally effective communication of ideas; • Generally accurately written with some use of specialist vocabulary/terms.
Level 3	6–9	14–19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Occasional analysis of evidence/issues; • Limited evaluation or engagement with sources/task; • Poorly structured response with little or no argument; • Occasionally effective communication of ideas; • Occasionally accurately written with some recognisable specialist vocabulary/terms.
Level 2	3–5	6–13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very superficial analysis of evidence/issues; • Little or no evaluation or engagement with sources/task; • Very poorly structured or unstructured response; • Little or no effective communication of ideas.
Level 1	0–2	0–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no accuracy in the writing or recognisable specialist vocabulary/terms.

A2 Classics Marking Grid for units CC7–CC10: notes

QCA guidance now requires the marks awarded for AO2b to be fully integrated within AO2 as a whole.

		AO1	AO2
<i>Section A Commentary Questions</i>	Qa	10	15
	Qb	10	15
<i>Section B Essays</i>		20	30
<i>Total</i>		40	60
<i>Weighting</i>		40%	60%
<i>Total mark for each A2 unit</i>		100	

Quality of Written Communication (QWC): The QCA Guidance for Awarding Bodies stipulates that QWC should be assessed when answers require paragraphs or essays, not single sentences.

The QCA Guidance stipulates that all three strands of QWC must be explicitly addressed – hence in the AO2 Marking Grid the presence of bullet points 3–5.

There are no separate weightings for AOs 2a and 2b but, in assigning a mark for AO2, examiners should focus first on AO2(a) – ie bullet points 1 and 2 – to decide the appropriate Level. They should then consider the evidence of QWC to help them decide where within the Level it is best to locate the candidate's mark. Other evidence, for example a stronger showing on the analysis than on the evaluation strand of AO2a, will also inform an examiner's decision about where to locate the mark within the Level.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity



OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2010