Question 1

Across the world, sites and structures have been the destination of people on religious pilgrimages.

Select and clearly identify two sites or structures of religious pilgrimages. Your choices must come from two different cultural traditions; at least one of your choices must come from beyond the European tradition. Using specific visual evidence, analyze how features of each site or structure shape the intended experience of the pilgrims. (30 minutes)

Background

This question asks students to identify two specific sites or structures that are the destinations of religious pilgrimages. At least one site or structure must come from beyond the European tradition. Using specific visual evidence, students must analyze how specific features of each site or structure shape the intended experience of the pilgrims. The intent of this question is to measure students’ ability to analyze how characteristics of a site or structure are used to shape an intended experience.

Although pilgrimage can be defined broadly as a journey to a place that is well known or respected, this question specifies that the sites or structures must be the destinations of pilgrimages that are specifically religious in nature. Religious pilgrimages have inspired the construction and embellishment of some of art history’s most significant structures, such as the church of Saint Peter’s in Rome, Italy; the Ise Shrine in Ise, Japan; and the Kaaba in Mecca, Saudi Arabia. Religious pilgrimages frequently involve travel over great distances; however, many pilgrimages have taken place within more localized settings. For example, Greek temple complexes were often the destination of journeys that had a religious motivation but varied in terms of their length. Pilgrims from afar approached the oracle at the Temple of Apollo at Delphi seeking advice by way of a zigzag path through the sanctuary, whereas Athenians approached the Parthenon on the Acropolis to venerate the cult statue of Athena via a winding but more localized processional route.

Frequently, religious pilgrimages have entailed not only travel toward a particular destination, but also the performance of prescribed physical movements or ritualized activities upon reaching the destination. For instance, upon entering the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem, Muslim pilgrims circumambulate the rock at the center of the building via an ambulatory that is decorated with mosaic inscriptions from the Quran. Similarly, Buddhist pilgrims to the Great Stupa at Sanchi, India, venerate the Buddha by circumambulating the stupa, which is believed to hold his relics. The same is true of Christian pilgrimage churches dating from the European Middle Ages, such as the Church of Saint James at Santiago de Compostela in Spain, where a pilgrimage chevet directs pilgrims to ambulatory chapels. The experience of the pilgrim is thus shaped by specific features of the site and structure.

Notably, the experience of the pilgrim may be shaped by visual stimuli that do not require movement once the destination has been reached. For example, the sculptural programs attached to Medieval pilgrimage destinations, as in the case of the Last Judgment scene on the West Portal of the Church of Saint-Lazare at Autun, France, may have been intended to provide a warning to the pilgrims who arrived on the doorstep. The monumental Nio—guardian figures—carved by Unkei and Kaikei at the south gate of Todai-ji in Nara likely performed a similar function, intended to ward off evil spirits and keep the temple grounds free of thieves.
For this question, sites of secular pilgrimage are inappropriate examples. These would include the Taj Mahal in Agra, India, or the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, D.C., as well as prehistoric sites, such as the Caves of Lascaux or Stonehenge, in which the concept of religious pilgrimage cannot be discussed with any certainty. Similarly, religious sites and structures that shape the experience of their audience but which are not specifically pilgrimage sites are not appropriate choices for this question.

Two Tasks for Students

1. Select and clearly identify two sites or structures of religious pilgrimage, at least one of which must come from beyond the European tradition.

2. Use specific visual evidence to analyze how features of each site or structure shape the intended experience of the pilgrims.

Points to Remember

For this question, both sites or structures must be destinations of pilgrimages that are specifically religious in nature.

The identification of each site or structure must be clear; however, identifications may be located within the body of the essay, or the specific identification may emerge only through the description of the work.

Note that not all religious sites and structures are pilgrimage sites. Appropriate choices are sites or structures that were intentionally constructed or modified to accommodate and facilitate pilgrimage. A religious site or structure not primarily used for pilgrimage is a less appropriate choice and therefore will contain errors.

To answer the question successfully, students must identify the pilgrims’ intended experience in at least a general way. If students do not address the intended experience of the pilgrims, it will be difficult for them to analyze specific features of the sites or structures in a manner relevant to the question.

If a student provides more than two examples, the two better examples should be scored, keeping in mind that one example must still come from beyond the European tradition.

Prehistoric examples, such as the Caves of Lascaux or Stonehenge, about which little information regarding religious function or cultural context is available, are not acceptable choices and should not be scored.

Students are not asked to compare and contrast the two works.

Notes written in the blank space above the response should not be scored.
Scoring Criteria

9–8 points
Response demonstrates thorough knowledge and understanding of the question.
The student clearly and correctly identifies two appropriate sites or structures of religious pilgrimage. Using specific visual evidence, the student analyzes how features of each site or structure shape the intended experience of the pilgrims. The response may include minor errors that do not have a meaningful effect on the analysis.

A score of 8 may be earned when the response is slightly unbalanced—with a stronger analysis of either one example or the other, although both are represented—and/or includes several minor errors that do not have a meaningful effect on the analysis.

7–6 points
Response demonstrates sufficient knowledge and understanding of the question.
The student correctly identifies two appropriate sites or structures of religious pilgrimage. Using specific visual evidence, the student analyzes how features of each site or structure shape the intended experience of the pilgrims. However, the response may be somewhat unbalanced and/or may include minor errors that have some effect on the analysis.

The score of 6 may be earned when the essay is significantly unbalanced and/or contains several minor errors that have some effect on analysis.

5 points
Response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding of the question.
The student identifies two appropriate sites or structures of religious pilgrimage. Using visual evidence, the student discusses how features of each site or structure shape the intended experience of the pilgrims; however, the discussion is less analytical than descriptive. It may be overly general, simplistic, digressive, or unbalanced. For example, the discussion of one of the sites or structures may be mostly accurate, whereas the discussion of the other includes errors that affect the response.

OR
The student identifies only one appropriate site or structure of religious pilgrimage, but the student uses specific visual evidence to analyze how features of the site or structure shape the intended experience of the pilgrims.

NOTE. This is the highest score an essay can earn if the student identifies and analyzes only one appropriate site or structure of religious pilgrimage correctly and coherently.

4–3 points
Response demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the question.
The student identifies two appropriate sites or structures of religious pilgrimage. The identification of these sites or structures may be incomplete, implied, and/or contain errors. Using evidence, the student discusses how features of each site or structure shape the intended experience of the pilgrims. However, the discussion is limited, digressive, overly unbalanced, and/or contains significant errors.

OR
Question 1 (continued)

The student identifies only one appropriate site or structure of religious pilgrimage, but the discussion demonstrates sufficient knowledge and understanding of how features of the site or structure shape the intended experience of the pilgrims.

The score of 3 may be earned if both examples are appropriate, but the discussion contains many significant errors.

2–1 point
Response demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of the question.
The student identifies two appropriate sites or structures of religious pilgrimage. The identifications of the examples may be incomplete, implied, and/or contain errors. The response demonstrates general familiarity with the issues raised by the question. However, the discussion is weak, overly descriptive, and/or contains significant errors.

OR

The student identifies only one appropriate site or structure of religious pilgrimage. The discussion demonstrates some knowledge and understanding of how features of the site or structure shape the intended experience of the pilgrims.

A score of 1 may be earned, with one or more appropriate sites or structures of religious pilgrimage, when the discussion is either irrelevant or too limited to ascertain the student’s level of knowledge or understanding.

0 points
Response demonstrates no discernible knowledge or understanding of the question.
The student attempts to respond, but the response is without merit because it simply restates the question, includes no appropriate or identifiable sites or structures of religious pilgrimage, and/or consists entirely of incorrect or irrelevant statements. The score of 0 points includes crossed-out words, personal notes, and drawings.

— This is a blank paper only.
Question 2

Throughout history, narrative has been used in art to communicate social, political, or religious meaning.

Select and clearly identify two works of art that use narrative. One of your examples must date before 1800 C.E., and one must date after 1800 C.E. For each work, identify the content of the narrative and analyze how the work uses narrative to communicate social, political, or religious meaning. (30 minutes)

Background

This question asks students to identify two works of art that use narrative to communicate social, political, or religious meaning. One of the works must date before 1800 C.E. and one must date after 1800 C.E. Students must identify the content of each work’s narrative and then analyze how the work uses narrative to communicate social, political, or religious meaning. Appropriate works may be drawn from a variety of cultures, periods, and media. The intent of this question is to have students demonstrate understanding of how art uses narrative to convey a range of meanings that are often determined by historical and cultural contexts.

Although narrative constitutes a common element in art, the manner in which it has been used to communicate social, political, or religious meaning has varied considerably throughout history. Narrative in this case can be defined as the visual representation of some kind of story, whether a specific moment within a story or a sequence of events. Narrative works can illustrate well-known historical, religious, or mythical stories drawn from textual sources or from an oral tradition. The relating of an event as it unfolds over time, however, is a difficult task for the visual arts, because a work of art often lacks an obvious beginning, middle, and end—essential features of any story. In response to this challenge, artists across both time and cultures have found creative ways to represent narrative sequence, in which the story and the form in which it is represented function together to communicate specific meaning. For instance, artists have often sought to present multiple points of a narrative within a single image to convey meaning, as in the case of Masaccio’s The Tribute Money (circa 1424–1427). Or, artists encapsulate a sequential event within an individual composition, as in Pablo Picasso’s Guernica (1937). In other instances, artists have employed continuous narrative to communicate a political message, as in the relief cycle of the Column of Trajan in Rome (dedicated 112 C.E.).

Successful responses will focus on works that clearly use narrative to communicate a specific social, political, or religious meaning. For instance, appropriate examples that date before 1800 C.E. include works such as the Stele of Naram-Sin (circa 2254–2218 B.C.E.); the Bayeux Tapestry (circa 1070–1080); Ghiberti’s Gates of Paradise (1425–1452); and Hogarth’s The Breakfast Scene from Marriage à la Mode (circa 1745). Although students need not discuss works from outside the European tradition, appropriate examples from a larger global perspective that date before 1800 C.E. include the Japanese wood panel Hungry Tigress Jataka (circa 650 C.E.), the Japanese narrative scroll Night Attack on the Sanjô Palace (circa 13th century C.E.) and the representation of the founding of Tenochtitlan from the Codex Mendoza (circa 1540–1542). Appropriate examples that date after 1800 C.E. include works such as Géricault’s The Raft of the Medusa (1818–1819); Rodin’s The Burghers of Calais (1884-1889); Ringgold’s Who’s Afraid of Aunt Jemima? (1983); and Walker’s Darkytown Rebellion (2001).

Note that students who use inappropriate choices—such as works of art that do not use narrative to communicate social, political, or religious meaning—will encounter great difficulties when attempting to construct meaningful arguments that respond to the issues posed.
Question 2 (continued)

Along the same lines, responses that discuss a work’s narrative without analyzing the manner in which the narrative is used to communicate social, political, or religious meaning do not actually answer the question. To earn full credit, students must do more than just restate the work’s narrative.

Three Tasks for Students

1. Select and clearly identify two works of art that use narrative. One example must date before 1800 C.E. and one must date after 1800 C.E.

2. Identify the content of the narrative in each work.

3. Analyze how each work uses narrative to communicate social, political, or religious meaning.

Points to Remember

For an example to be appropriate for this question, it must use a narrative with a social, political, or religious meaning.

Symbols, allegory, and iconography may all be features of a narrative; however, they are not narratives in their own right.

Students are not asked to link narrative to form and style as part of their discussion. They are asked to address narrative content and its relation to meaning.

The identification of each work must be clear; however, identifications may be located within the body of the essay, or the specific identification may emerge only through the description of the work.

Works may be in any medium, but one work of art must date before 1800 C.E., and one must date after 1800 C.E. If both examples date from before 1800 C.E. or after 1800 C.E., the better analysis should be scored.

Similarly, if a student provides more than two examples, the two better examples should be scored, keeping in mind that one must still date from before 1800 C.E. and one after 1800 C.E.

Students are not limited to examples from the European tradition. They may select works of art from a larger global perspective, provided they adhere to the chronological requirement.

Prehistoric examples, such as the Caves of Lascaux, about which little information regarding specific narratives or meaning are available, are not appropriate choices and should not be scored.

Students are not asked to compare or contrast the two works.

Notes written in the blank space above the response should not be scored.
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Question 2 (continued)

Scoring Criteria

9–8 points
Response demonstrates thorough knowledge and understanding of the question.
The student clearly and correctly identifies two appropriate works of art that use narrative. For each work, the student clearly and correctly identifies the content of the narrative and analyzes how the work uses narrative to communicate social, political, or religious meaning. The response may include minor errors that do not have a meaningful effect on the analysis.

A score of 8 may be earned when the response is slightly unbalanced—with a stronger analysis of either one example or the other, although both are represented—and/or includes several minor errors that do not have a meaningful effect on the analysis.

7–6 points
Response demonstrates sufficient knowledge and understanding of the question.
The student correctly identifies two appropriate works of art that use narrative. For each work, the student identifies the content of the narrative and analyzes how the work uses narrative to communicate social, political, or religious meaning. However, the response may be somewhat unbalanced and/or may include minor errors that have some effect on the analysis.

The score of 6 may be earned when the essay is significantly unbalanced and/or contains several minor errors that have some effect on analysis.

5 points
Response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding of the question.
The student identifies two appropriate works of art that use narrative. For each work, the student identifies the content of the narrative and discusses how the work uses narrative to communicate social, political, or religious meaning. However, the discussion is less analytical than descriptive. It may be overly general, simplistic, digressive, or unbalanced. For example, the discussion of one of the works may be mostly accurate, whereas the discussion of the other includes errors that affect the response.

OR
The student identifies only one appropriate work of art that uses narrative, but the student correctly identifies the content of the narrative and analyzes how the work uses narrative to communicate social, political, or religious meaning.

NOTE. This is the highest score an essay can earn if the student identifies and analyzes only one appropriate work of art that use narrative correctly and coherently.

4–3 points
Response demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the question.
The student identifies two appropriate works of art that use narrative. The identification of these works may be incomplete, implied, and/or contain errors. For each work, the student identifies the content of the narrative and discusses how the work uses narrative to communicate social, political, or religious meaning. However, the discussion is limited, digressive, overly unbalanced, and/or contains significant errors.

OR
Question 2 (continued)

The student identifies only one appropriate work of art that uses narrative but the discussion demonstrates sufficient knowledge and understanding both of the content of the narrative and how the work uses narrative to communicate social, political, or religious meaning.

The score of 3 may be earned if both examples are appropriate, but the discussion contains many significant errors.

2–1 point
Response demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of the question.
The student identifies two appropriate works of art that use narrative. The identifications of the examples may be incomplete, implied, and/or contain errors. The response demonstrates general familiarity with the issues raised by the question. However, the discussion is weak, overly descriptive, and/or contains significant errors.

OR

The student identifies only one appropriate work of art that uses narrative. The discussion demonstrates some knowledge and understanding of both of the content of the narrative and how the work uses narrative to communicate social, political, or religious meaning.

A score of 1 may be earned, with one or more appropriate works of art that use narrative, when the discussion is either irrelevant or too limited to ascertain the student’s level of knowledge or understanding.

0 points
Response demonstrates no discernible knowledge or understanding of the question.
The student attempts to respond, but the response is without merit because it simply restates the question, includes no appropriate or identifiable works of art that use narrative, and/or consists entirely of incorrect or irrelevant statements. The score of 0 points includes crossed-out words, personal notes, and drawings.

— This is a blank paper only.
The general view and detail show the Arch of Constantine.

What was the intended meaning of the monument? Analyze how the reuse of sculptural fragments from other Roman works of art reinforces the intended meaning of the monument. (10 minutes)

Background

This question asks students to analyze both the intended meaning of an artwork and how that meaning is created. Specifically, the question asks students to analyze how the reuse of sculptural fragments from other Roman works of art (spolia) is used to assert a particular political agenda by associating Constantine with “good” emperors from Rome’s past. This is not only a question about appropriation, but more significantly, how appropriation can be used to assert power and authority. The intent of the question is to prompt students to draw upon their knowledge of the Arch of Constantine’s form, function, content, and context in order to address how it references Rome’s imperial past to assert the legitimacy of Constantine’s rule.

The Arch of Constantine in Rome was dedicated in 315 C.E. to commemorate Constantine’s victory over Maxentius at the Milvian Bridge in 312 C.E. and his subsequent accession to the imperial throne. The monument was commissioned by the Roman Senate to honor the new emperor. Its dedicatory inscription reads:

“To the Emperor Constantine from the Senate and the People of Rome. Since through divine inspiration and great wisdom he has delivered the state from the tyrant and his party by his army and noble arms, [we] dedicate this arch, decorated with triumphal insignia.”

Placed between the Colosseum and Forum, the arch was situated in a highly visible and public location, thereby ensuring that its message would be readily accessible, prominently proclaiming Constantine’s rule at the heart of Rome. The very form of the triumphal arch, moreover, was an established indicator of imperial triumph. In addition to serving as permanent triumphal monuments, arches were incorporated into the spectacle of imperial processions which would pass through archways as part of the performance of victory and imperial ascendency, as seen in the reliefs on the Arch of Titus. This physical ritualized function of the triumphal arch served to connect the body of the emperor to the actual city—and empire—of which he was in control. The Arch of Constantine therefore refers to earlier models as a formal means of associating the emperor with Rome’s illustrious imperial past.

To reinforce this meaning, sculptural elements were taken from earlier Roman monuments and incorporated into the Arch of Constantine. This reuse of materials is known as spoliation, in which spolia (the elements taken from earlier monuments) are appropriated and placed within a new context to fashion new meanings. In the case of the Arch of Constantine, this was done with the express purpose of associating Constantine with emperors of the Pax Romana, thereby asserting that Constantine’s rule continues (or revives) Rome’s glorious imperial legacy. These spoliated elements are included among the “triumphal insignia” noted in the arch’s inscription. Eight roundels or medallions—two of which are shown in the detail image—come from the time of Hadrian. The rectangular reliefs in the attic were originally part of an arch dedicated to Marcus Aurelius. The eight figural sculptures likely come from the Forum of Trajan. The reuse and incorporation of these elements in the monument therefore associated Constantine with the glorious imperial tradition of the Pax Romana while simultaneously visually and spatially reifying his authority in the Roman capital. Additionally, some of the heads on the older reliefs were refashioned to fit Constantine’s appearance, literally making him appear as a “new Hadrian” (along with the other
emperors). Furthermore, new inscriptions were added to the older reliefs so as to emphasize Constantine's achievements as liberator of Rome (*Liberator Urbis*) and restorer of peace (*Fundator Quietus*). The reuse of these elements visually associated Constantine with notions of virtue, beneficent rule, and imperial strength, as manifest in the legacy of the illustrious earlier emperors.

Moreover, while the question does not explicitly seek this information, it might be useful to know that juxtaposed with these spoliated reliefs were new reliefs (circa 315 C.E.) showing Constantine as a beneficent ruler: distributing goods, addressing the people of Rome while flanked by statues of Hadrian and Marcus Aurelius, and vanquishing his enemies (visible at the bottom of the detail). Conceptually, these reliefs align with the overall meaning of the monument in their clear elucidation of the benefits of Constantine's rule; namely, a newly restored peace and order that further linked Constantine to the *Pax Romana*. Given the turbulent circumstances of Constantine's accession to the throne, such allusions to the *Pax Romana* suggested that Constantine had ushered in a new era of peace and was therefore a legitimate and laudable emperor. Stylistically, the Constantinian reliefs differ from the classicism of the spoliated elements of the Roman art of the High Empire in that they eschew absolute naturalism in favor of a clear articulation of the concept: to proclaim the emperor's legitimate rule. Together, the juxtaposition of old and new reliefs contextualizes Constantine's rule within the larger tradition of the beneficent empire. Constantine is aligned with the rulers of the past, but he is presented as initiating a new rule that returns Rome to its glory days. Ultimately, all of these elements serve to legitimize and proclaim Constantine as a new emperor in the glorious Roman imperial tradition.

**Two Tasks for Students**

1. Identify the intended meaning of the monument.

2. Analyze how the reuse of sculptural fragments from other Roman works of art reinforces the intended meaning of the monument.

**Points to Remember**

This is a contextual question that addresses power and authority. Since students are given the title and patron of the work, they should be able to focus their responses on analyzing how the reuse of sculptural fragments from other Roman works of art reinforces the intended meaning of the Arch of Constantine to legitimize Constantine's rule.

To do this, students must first identify the monument's intended meaning as imperial propaganda. If students do not address the intended meaning of the Arch of Constantine, it will be difficult to analyze the reuse of sculptural fragments from other Roman works of art in a manner relevant to the question.

Students do not have to discuss the specific detail shown; however, they must discuss the monument's reuse of sculptural fragments from other Roman works of art in order to answer the question.
Question 3 (continued)

Scoring Criteria

4 points
**Response demonstrates thorough knowledge and understanding of the question.**
The response clearly and correctly identifies the intended meaning of the monument. The response clearly and correctly analyzes how the reuse of sculptural fragments from other Roman works of art reinforces the intended meaning of the monument. The response may include minor errors that do not have a meaningful effect on the analysis.

3 points
**Response demonstrates sufficient knowledge and understanding of the question.**
The response correctly identifies the intended meaning of the monument. The response correctly analyzes how the reuse of sculptural fragments from other Roman works of art reinforces the intended meaning of the monument. However, the response may be somewhat unbalanced—with a stronger discussion of either the monument’s intended meaning or how the reuse of sculptural fragments reinforces the intended meaning, although both are represented—and/or may include minor errors that have some effect on the analysis.

2 points
**Response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding of the question.**
The response correctly identifies the intended meaning of the monument, although the identification may be implied rather than stated directly. The response attempts to address how the reuse of sculptural fragments from other Roman works of art reinforces the intended meaning of the monument, but the discussion of that evidence is less analytical than descriptive. It may be overly general, simplistic, or unbalanced. For example, the discussion of the intended meaning may be mostly accurate, whereas the discussion of the reuse of sculptural fragments includes errors that affect the response.

1 point
**Response demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of the question.**
The response demonstrates some general familiarity with the issues raised by the question. However, the response is weak, overly descriptive, and/or contains significant errors. If the response correctly identifies the intended meaning of the monument, then there is no other discussion of merit.

OR
The response does not identify the intended meaning of the monument even in a general way, but the response does include some relevant discussion of the monument’s reuse of sculptural fragments from other Roman works of art.

0 points
**Response demonstrates no discernible knowledge or understanding of the question.**
The student attempts to respond, but the response makes only incorrect or irrelevant statements about the Arch of Constantine. The score of 0 points includes crossed-out words, personal notes, and drawings.

— This is a blank paper only.
The work is *The School of Athens* by Raphael.

Analyze how both the subject matter and the style of the work reflect humanist interests during the High Renaissance. (10 minutes)

Background

The question asks students to analyze how both the form and the content of a particular work reflect the intellectual concerns of the period during which it was made. Specifically, the question asks how both the subject matter and the style of *The School of Athens* reflect the humanist interests of the High Renaissance. The intent of this question is to prompt students to use skills of both formal and contextual analysis to situate *The School of Athens* within its art-historical period.

Humanism is the term used to describe the intellectual movement of the late Medieval and Renaissance periods that was first begun by scholars, called *umanisti*, in opposition to medieval Scholasticism, the university model of Paris. Interested in the revival of Classical languages and texts for their utility in contemporary society, humanists looked to the great democratic cultures of Classical Athens and Classical Rome as ideal models for the present. Humanists believed that knowledge could only be attained through well-rounded study of the liberal arts. As part of this movement, there arose the first systemization of language—Latin—using Cicero’s rhetorical style as the epitome. Soon the intense textual focus on Classical Antiquity resulted in a broader interest in the culture and arts of the ancient period. For Italians, this focus was centered on Rome, inspiring scholars and artists to travel to the city to obtain first-hand knowledge of its ancient monuments. The incorporation of Classical motifs and models is therefore one of the distinguishing features of Italian Renaissance art.

Raphael’s *The School of Athens* incorporates this humanistic interest in both its subject matter and its style, thereby reflecting the culture of the High Renaissance. Painted by Raffaello Santi, known as Raphael, between 1509 and 1511 C.E., *The School of Athens* represents the discipline of Philosophy on one wall of the *Stanza della Segnatura*, located within the papal apartments of Pope Julius II in the Vatican. Pope Julius II used the room as a library. It was where he signed official documents as well as kept humanistic texts. The texts, like the frescoes on the four walls of the room, were most likely arranged according to four intellectual disciplines: Theology, Philosophy, Poetry, and Jurisprudence.

*The School of Athens* is the most famous of the *Stanza della Segnatura’s* four frescoes and is filled with representations of distinguished philosophers from Classical Antiquity to the early 16th century; individuals who were revered by Renaissance humanists. This gathering of Plato, Aristotle, and other great ancient thinkers such as Socrates, Pythagoras, Ptolemy, and Zoroaster, together with contemporary scholars, such as Tommaso Inghirami (the Vatican librarian, dressed as Epicurus in the lower left with the wreath on his head), and artists, including portraits of Michelangelo (lower center, with head resting on fist) and Raphael (lower far right, looking out to the viewer), suggests that the Rome of Pope Julius II was a “New Rome” in an enlightened age. In terms of subject matter, the painting also includes self-conscious references to the Classical sculptures and buildings of Rome that were popular at the beginning of the 16th century, both to collectors like Pope Julius II and to humanists, who came to the city for work or study. For instance, the building in which the philosophers gather takes the form of a Greek cross, with coffered arches reminiscent of the Basilica of Maxentius and Constantine in the Roman Forum. The architectural plan most likely was inspired by the current building project of St. Peter’s basilica, sponsored by Pope Julius II and undertaken by the architect Bramante. Monumental marble sculptures of the ancient gods are set in niches that line the walls.
Such emphasis on ancient culture in The School of Athens, coupled with the architectural allusion to the current building project of St. Peter’s, is indicative of the blending of ancient philosophy with Christianity under the reign of Julius II, and reflects the humanist interests of the era.

In terms of style, The School of Athens exemplifies a Classical instinct combined with a sense of self-assurance indicative of the High Renaissance. The fresco reflects humanist interests in that its formal aspects are modeled after the Classical principles of harmony, balance, and symmetry in order to provide an idealized setting, flooded with a clarifying light that dignifies the prestigious gathering. With the use of one-point perspective as an organizing element, Raphael emphasizes how his interest in illusionism equates with an investigation of the natural world that humanists went to such great lengths to explore. In addition, the sculptural solidity of the human forms, as well as their grounded placement within their rationalized surroundings, ties the schematic program to the earthly domain of man and human perception. The figures are also individualized, bearing the countenance of many of Raphael’s contemporaries. This may suggest a parallel between the dynamic energy of the Italian Renaissance with that of the antique past, ennobling the ideas and actions of singular minds. Moreover, in a composition that conveys symmetry and balance, the scholars are grouped either with Plato (to the left) or Aristotle (to the right), with placement determined by whether the scholars were interested primarily in matters of heaven or the earth. The poses of the two central philosophers reflect the philosophical arguments contained in the texts held in their left hands: Plato holds his Timaeus and uses his right hand to point to the heavens to the eternal truths that exist in idea only, while Aristotle holds his Ethics and extends his right hand out forward from his body with his palm facing toward the material earth, which he argued was the empirical reality that can be measured through sight and touch. Rather than being divisive, however, Raphael’s composition uses perspective to harmonize these two schools of thought, with the viewer’s gaze directed upwards through the successive series of arches into the sky beyond, bringing together not only Platonists and Aristotelians, but also Christians with humanists at the center of the work, and thereby creating one unified School of Athens.

Two Tasks for Students

1. Analyze how the subject matter of The School of Athens reflects the humanist interests during the High Renaissance.

2. Analyze how the style of The School of Athens reflects the humanist interests during the High Renaissance.

Points to Remember

This question asks students to combine skills of both formal and contextual analysis. Since students are given the name of the artist, the title of the work, and the art-historical period during which the work was created, students should be able to focus their responses on analyzing how The School of Athens reflects the humanist interests of the High Renaissance.

If students do not address humanist interests during the High Renaissance in at least a general way, it will be difficult to analyze the painting in a manner relevant to the question. Students must identify, at least implicitly, what the humanist interests during the High Renaissance were in order to analyze The School of Athens in a manner relevant to the question.

Although students may identify the specific philosophers represented in the painting, they are not required to do so. Such identification can help provide context for a more thorough discussion of humanism, but it is not essential for answering the question.
**Scoring Criteria**

**4 points**
**Response demonstrates thorough knowledge and understanding of the question.**
The response clearly and correctly analyzes how both the subject matter and the style of the work reflect humanist interests during the High Renaissance. The response may include minor errors that do not have a meaningful effect on the analysis.

**3 points**
**Response demonstrates sufficient knowledge and understanding of the question.**
The response correctly analyzes how both the subject matter and the style of the work reflect humanist interests during the High Renaissance. However, the response may be somewhat unbalanced—with a stronger analysis of either subject matter or style, although both are represented—and/or may include minor errors that have some effect on the analysis.

**2 points**
**Response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding of the question.**
The response attempts to address how both the subject matter and the style of the work reflect humanist interests during the High Renaissance, but the discussion of that evidence is less analytical than descriptive. It may be overly general, simplistic, or unbalanced. For example, the discussion of the subject matter may be mostly accurate, whereas the discussion of the style includes errors that affect the response.

OR
The response analyzes how *The School of Athens* reflects humanist interests during the High Renaissance, but the response focuses entirely on either subject matter or style, not both.

**NOTE**: This is the highest score a response can earn if it does not discuss both the subject matter and the style of the work.

**1 point**
**Response demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of the question.**
The response demonstrates some general familiarity with the issues raised by the question by discussing how the subject matter and/or the style of the work reflects humanist interests during the High Renaissance. However, the response is weak, overly descriptive, and/or contains significant errors.

**0 points**
**Response demonstrates no discernible knowledge or understanding of the question.**
The student attempts to respond, but the response makes only incorrect or irrelevant statements about *The School of Athens*. The score of 0 points includes crossed-out words, personal notes, and drawings.

— This is a blank paper only.
Attribute the painting to the artist who painted it. Justify your attribution by discussing specific visual characteristics of the painting that are commonly associated with the work of that artist. (10 minutes)

**Background**

This question asks students to correctly attribute a painting to the artist who painted it. Students are asked to justify the attribution by discussing specific visual characteristics of the painting commonly associated with the work of that artist. The intent of this question is to have students apply their knowledge of the visual characteristics of an artist’s paintings to their discussion of a presumably unknown work.

The painting is *The Meeting at the Golden Gate*, painted in 1305 C.E. by Giotto di Bondone as part of the decorative program of the Arena Chapel (Cappella Scrovegni) in Padua, Italy. In the chapel, Giotto organized successive sacred episodes into multiple registers on the walls. The narrative of the story of Joachim and Anna, with which *The Meeting at the Golden Gate* concludes, begins on the upper level of the south wall of the chapel and continues from east to west. The fresco highlights Giotto’s gestural naturalism in the encounter between Joachim and Anna: the two figures tenderly embrace one another outside the Golden Gate of Jerusalem and press their lips together. Giotto renders his figures with volumetric weight, using chiaroscuro to model the folds of their draperies and to emphasize their solidity. The architecture of the gate behind them is conceived in perspective to distinguish the foreground from the middle and backgrounds of the spatial field. The left and upper edges of the painting are filled with ultramarine blue pigment, a reference to the blue sky found in nature. The scene is framed and bordered with floral and vegetal decoration on all sides. To the left and right, vertical panels are punctuated by *quatrefoil oculi* that feature images of martyrs and saints. These vertical panels are used to separate one scene from the next in the larger context of the chapel.

Significantly, *The Meeting at the Golden Gate*, and the other scenes in the Arena Chapel, is distinguished from earlier representations of the same subject that were made by other artists via Giotto’s focus on representing the emotional and physical presence of his figures. While the iconography is clearly recognizable, the bodies are rendered not only as monumental, but as clearly occupying the space in which they inhabit. Furthermore, the figures are given emotional depth through their individual facial expressions and gestures. As Joachim and Anna join together in their kiss, Anna’s hands delicately play with Joachim’s hair and they stare into one another’s eyes. To emphasize their union, Giotto combines their haloes into one and joins their bodies to form an arch, which echoes the arch of the gate behind them. Small details of everyday life, such as the particular 14th-century garb of the women standing under the archway or the characteristic form of the basket held by the herdsman on the left, would have made the scene more accessible to its original viewers by placing the sacred scene in their temporal present.

In justifying the attribution, students may cite a range of specific visual characteristics that connect *The Meeting at the Golden Gate* to formal or conceptual features found in other works by Giotto. Students may cite such details as the weighty folds of the drapery or the plasticity of the figures, the use of chiaroscuro and perspective, as well as the charged emotional content, all of which are deployed to illustrate the narrative. With regard to subject matter, students may situate Giotto in terms of both the broader category of Christian iconography, as well as this particular painting’s presentation of a Biblical scene. In some cases, students may link *The Meeting at the Golden Gate* to other specific frescoes by Giotto in the Arena Chapel, such as *The Lamentation*. As part of the same pictorial program, both *The Meeting at the Golden Gate* and *The Lamentation* convey a similar sense of theatricality through the stage like setting in which
figures are crisply outlined against a brilliant blue sky. Both works illustrate innovations in perspective as well as a certain naturalism and temporality that marks a departure from earlier artistic styles. Whether or not such a specific comparison is attempted, students should be able to attribute *The Meeting at the Golden Gate* to Giotto through its characteristic visual drama.

**Two Tasks for Students**

1. Correctly attribute the painting to Giotto.

2. Justify the attribution by discussing specific visual characteristics of the painting that are commonly associated with the work of Giotto.

**Points to Remember**

This is an attribution question. The question requires an attribution to a specific artist, not to an art-historical movement or period. The correct answer is Giotto. The highest score a response can earn if the painting is not correctly attributed to Giotto is 2 points.

Students may imply an attribution to Giotto by identifying the artist not by name but as the same artist who painted works such as *The Lamentation* in the Arena Chapel. The highest score this kind of attribution can earn is 2 points.

When a response is granted partial credit, attention should be paid to the plausibility of the evidence cited for the incorrect artist and whether such evidence could reasonably apply to Giotto’s *The Meeting at the Golden Gate*. In general, an incorrect attribution to another 14th-century artist, such as Cimabue or Duccio, will be a stronger response than an incorrect attribution to an artist outside of Giotto’s era.

Note that students are not required to identify the painting or to provide a specific comparison to another work by Giotto, although some students may include such details in their responses.
Scoring Criteria

4 points  
Response demonstrates thorough knowledge and understanding of the question.  
The painting is clearly and correctly attributed to Giotto. The response justifies the attribution by citing specific visual characteristics of the painting that are commonly associated with the work of Giotto. The response may include minor errors that do not have a meaningful effect on the discussion.

3 points  
Response demonstrates sufficient knowledge and understanding of the question.  
The painting is correctly attributed to Giotto. The response justifies the attribution by citing visual characteristics of the painting that are commonly associated with the work of Giotto. However, the response may be somewhat general and/or include minor errors that have some effect on the discussion.

2 points  
Response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding of the question.  
The painting is correctly attributed to Giotto, although this attribution may be implied rather than stated directly. The response justifies the attribution by referring to visual characteristics of the painting that are commonly associated with other works by Giotto; however, the response may be overly general, simplistic, or descriptive. The response may contain errors that affect the discussion. OR  
The painting is attributed incorrectly, but the specific visual characteristics cited as justification can reasonably be applied both to this painting and to the work of the incorrect artist.

NOTE. This is the highest score a response can earn if it does not correctly attribute the painting to Giotto.

1 point  
Response demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of the question.  
The painting is correctly attributed to Giotto, but there is no other discussion of merit. OR  
The painting is attributed incorrectly. The response includes an attempt at justification, but the discussion may be overly general, simplistic, or descriptive, even if the visual characteristics cited as justification can reasonably be applied both to this painting and to the work of the incorrect artist.

0 points  
Response demonstrates no discernible knowledge or understanding of the question.  
The student attempts to respond, but the response makes only incorrect or irrelevant statements about the painting. The score of 0 points includes crossed-out words, personal notes, and drawings.

— This is a blank paper only.
The works were painted by two different artists associated with the nineteenth-century movement called Realism.

Using specific evidence, analyze how the works reflect the artists’ contrasting views of Realism. (10 minutes)

Background

This question asks students to analyze two contrasting views of the 19th-century artistic movement called Realism through an analysis of two Realist paintings, one by Gustave Courbet and one by Jean-François Millet. The intent of this question is to prompt students to consider that artistic styles, in this case Realism, can have multiple interpretations even by artists who consciously associate themselves with that style.

Realism flourished in France in the mid-19th century, although its origins can be traced to earlier writings. An assertion of the artist’s objective recording of the facts, Realism can be defined as an attitude toward one’s subject matter rather than a specific set of rules or techniques. It reflected a sense of the seriousness and truthfulness of art in its capacity to reflect the world. Taking as its subject matter scenes drawn from contemporary life rather than history or mythology, Realism purposefully included individuals and events previously seen as inappropriate subject matter for high art. Realist works could be politically charged, either in artistic intent or critical reception, although this was not always the case. As a style, Realism could encompass a variety of visual characteristics from highly refined, detailed, and polished surfaces typical of academic painting to coarse, flat, and heavily worked surfaces with broad brushstrokes and daubs of paint applied with a palette knife.

The works shown are, on the left, Burial at Ornans (1849–1850) by Gustave Courbet and, on the right, The Gleaners (1857) by Jean-François Millet. While both Courbet and Millet described their works as Realist, their understanding of the term diverged widely. Courbet’s Burial at Ornans was intended to capture the diverse and mundane aspects of rural life in a particular city at a particular event, while Millet’s The Gleaners was intended to ennable the hard life of peasant labor more generally. Through their works, Courbet presents an unsparing, specific, concrete, and often purposefully clumsy depiction of modern life, while Millet celebrates the timeless, nonspecific, agrarian, anti-urban, and even religious nature of his subjects.

More specifically, in Burial at Ornans, Courbet depicts a wide variety of rural types attending a time-honored cultural event: a funeral. The painting records a specific event, namely the funeral of a relative of the artist in the painter’s birthplace, the provincial town of Ornans. The image includes portraits of specific individuals among the mourners, Courbet’s parents and sisters among them. Previous representations of burial had suggested nobility, tranquility, repose and seriousness—all of which are conspicuously and purposely lacking in Courbet’s scene. Instead, Courbet treats this ordinary funeral with an unflattering bluntness. The massive scale of the work (10 x 22 feet) was traditionally reserved for the heroic or religious scenes identified with history painting. Indeed, the original title of the work, Painting of Human Figures, The History of a Burial at Ornans, underscored the link to history painting. Yet the horizontal arrangement of figures, non-idealized faces and gestures, and blunt handling of pigment were seen as a challenge to academic conventions.

Millet’s The Gleaners, by contrast, offers a competing vision of the “real,” in which peasant labor is ennobled. Rather than the specificity of detail found in Courbet’s work, Millet’s three figures are largely faceless and wholly absorbed in the laborious mode of work called gleaning. Gleaning is the act of
collecting leftover crops from farmers’ fields after they have been commercially harvested or on fields where it is not economically profitable to harvest. Gleaning was traditionally handled by the most impoverished members of society. Despite the toil and repetitiveness of their labor, Millet’s depiction of the scene suggests a timeless vision of agrarian life. Although the figures are isolated in the open field, Millet offers a glimpse of a larger way of life in the upper section of the painting where one sees numerous figures engaged in harvesting a field.

Together these two paintings show the diversity and complexity of Realism through their divergent styles, techniques and treatment of subject matter, despite their shared claim to access directly some kind of objective reality.

**Two Tasks for Students**

1. Identify specific evidence from each work that is associated with Realism.

2. Analyze how the works reflect the artists’ contrasting views of Realism.

**Points to Remember**

This is a comparative analysis question that emphasizes difference rather than similarity; in this case, two artists’ contrasting views of the same style. As such, students must contrast the two different views of Realism in the works shown in order to answer the question. A response that discusses only one of the two works is not, by definition, an exercise in contrast.

The highest score a response can earn if it discusses only one of the two works is 2 points.

To answer the question, students must define, at least in general terms, what is meant by Realism. If students do not define Realism, at least implicitly, they will not be able to analyze the works in a manner relevant to the question.

Students can answer the question by referencing the thematic and/or the stylistic traits of Realism seen in each work.

Students are not required to identify the names of the artists or to provide the titles of the paintings or to give the dates of their creation, although some students may do so.
Scoring Criteria

4 points
Response demonstrates thorough knowledge and understanding of the question.
Using specific evidence, the response clearly and correctly analyzes how the works reflect the artists’ contrasting views of Realism. The response may include minor errors that do not have a meaningful effect on the analysis.

3 points
Response demonstrates sufficient knowledge and understanding of the question.
Using specific evidence, the response correctly analyzes how the works reflect the artists’ contrasting views of Realism. However, the response may be somewhat unbalanced—with a stronger discussion of either Burial at Ornans or The Gleaners, although both are represented—and/or may include minor errors that have some effect on the analysis.

2 points
Response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding of the question.
Using evidence, the response attempts to address how the works reflect the artists’ contrasting views of Realism, but the discussion of that evidence is less analytical than descriptive. It may be overly general, simplistic, or unbalanced. For example, the discussion of Burial at Ornans may be mostly accurate, whereas the discussion of The Gleaners includes errors that affect the response.

OR
Using specific evidence, the response clearly and correctly analyzes how one of the works reflects the artist’s view of Realism.

NOTE: This is the highest score a response can earn that does not analyze both works.

1 point
Response demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of the question.
The response demonstrates some general familiarity with the issues raised by the question by attempting to address how either or both works reflect the artists’ contrasting views of Realism. However, the response is weak, overly descriptive, and/or contains significant errors.

0 points
Response demonstrates no discernible knowledge or understanding of the question.
The student attempts to respond, but the response makes only incorrect or irrelevant statements about Realism. The score of 0 points includes crossed-out words, personal notes, and drawings.

— This is a blank paper only.
Question 7

The plan and the aerial view show the Great Mosque of Djenné in present-day Mali.

Identify specific features in the building that are distinctive to mosque architecture. Analyze how mosque architecture relates to the practices of Islam. (10 minutes)

Background

This question asks students to identify the features of a mosque that are distinctive to the practice of Islam. The question assumes a measure of unity and continuity in mosque architecture, implying that certain features necessary to the correct practice of Islam will appear in all mosques, regardless of time, type, or place. The intent of the question is to prompt students to apply their knowledge of mosque architecture to a specific structure that may be less familiar to them.

The mosque was developed in the earliest days of Islam on the Arabian peninsula. One of the pillars of Islam decrees that Muslims pray towards Mecca five times a day, an activity that does not necessarily demand a designated space, but is certainly assisted both by protection from the elements as well as a permanent and reliable indication of the direction of Mecca. Friday noon prayers, as established in the Quran, were to take place in a mosque in company with other Muslims, so that the faithful could benefit from an imam’s sermon on moral, political, or social themes. Thus, every Muslim community requires a Friday mosque, and every Muslim is required, when possible, to live within a convenient journey of a community with such a mosque.

In terms of mosque architecture, many scholars believe that the original mosque form was inspired by Muhammad’s own house at Medina, probably constructed in 624 C.E. This building incorporated an open courtyard with rooms for the prophet’s family at one end, and an area shaded by palm branches supported by palm trunks at the other. Muhammad reportedly rested on a lance while praying and preaching sermons near the wall of the house towards Mecca, now known as the qibla. Thus, while the earliest surviving congregational mosques have demonstrated that a variety of different types of spaces have performed the function of a mosque, the most common form of mosque architecture originally imitated the basic shape of Muhammad’s house. It was comprised of an open courtyard, a deep portico with columns or pillars holding a roof on the qibla side, and further shallower porticoes around the rest of the open space. This form, known as the hypostyle mosque, has inspired much of mosque architecture. The popularity of the hypostyle hall can also be attributed to the ease in which it can be expanded as the community grows in size.

Many features common to most congregational mosques relate to the practices of Islam. The wall in the hypostyle hall that indicates the direction of Mecca is called the qibla. A niche known as a mihrab is placed in the qibla wall to identify it and thus the direction towards which prayers are to be directed. A mihrab can be placed anywhere on the qibla wall and some mosques have multiple mihrabs. The mihrab is commonly understood as a memorial of the spot where Muhammad, as the first imam, leaned while preaching in his house in Medina. In the 9th century, a minaret was added to most mosques to call the faithful to prayer, a job formerly accomplished from the roof of Muhammad’s house. Other features common to most congregational mosques are the provision of a covered prayer hall with a designated qibla wall marked by a mihrab, an enclosed courtyard, and one or several minarets. It is also important to note that decorations on the exteriors and interiors of mosques are strictly nonrepresentational.

That said, there is diversity in mosque form, just as there is variety in the features of different mosques, often inspired by regional architectural traditions. For this question, students are asked to apply this knowledge of mosque architecture to the Great Mosque of Djenné, an adobe structure at the heart of the
The general outlines of the Great Mosque of Djenné accord with typical mosque complexes, particularly because this is still today a functioning mosque with a local congregation. The first mosque on the site was probably built in the 13th century, following the conversion of the local king to Islam. That mosque was destroyed by fire in the early 19th century. It was rebuilt in 1906–1907 C.E. and followed the footprint of the much older mosque, but its outward appearance was probably dictated in part by the desires of the governing French community, who applied a uniform style to West African structures rebuilt in their colonial domains. Significantly, the Great Mosque of Djenné is made of regionally specific materials, such as sun-dried adobe brick. Timber beams called torons are used both decoratively and as a type of permanent scaffolding to assist in the annual replastering of the building. The east, or market, side of the mosque is embellished with three towers which are topped by finials of ostrich eggs, a symbol of fertility and purity unique to some West African mosques of the period.

From the plan and the aerial view of Great Mosque of Djenné, students should be able to identify the prayer hall, enclosed courtyard, and qibla wall with the mihrabs typical of hypostyle mosques, even if they have not studied this particular mosque before. They should be able to relate the prayer hall, qibla wall, and mihrab to the practices of Islam, given the importance of Islamic religious architecture to Muslim prayer.

Two Tasks for Students:

1. Identify specific features of the Great Mosque of Djenné that are distinctive to mosque architecture.
2. Analyze how mosque architecture relates to the practices of Islam.

Points to Remember

This question asks students to combine skills of both formal and contextual analysis to apply what they know about mosque architecture in general to the specific features of the Great Mosque of Djenné.

Students must identify practices of Islam in at least a general way. Otherwise, it will be difficult to analyze mosque architecture in a manner relevant to the question.

The question does not ask students to identify regionally specific features of the Great Mosque of Djenné, such as the torons, ostrich egg finials, or mud-brick architecture. Such information is irrelevant to the question.

Students do not have to discuss both the plan and the aerial view to receive credit.
Scoring Criteria

4 points
Response demonstrates thorough knowledge and understanding of the question.
The response clearly and correctly identifies specific features of the Great Mosque of Djenné that are distinctive to mosque architecture. The response clearly and correctly analyzes how mosque architecture relates to the practices of Islam. The response may include minor errors that do not have a meaningful effect on the analysis.

3 points
Response demonstrates sufficient knowledge and understanding of the question.
The response correctly identifies specific features of the Great Mosque of Djenné that are distinctive to mosque architecture. The response correctly analyzes how mosque architecture relates to the practices of Islam. However, the response may be somewhat unbalanced—with either a stronger discussion of the specific features of the Great Mosque of Djenné that are distinctive to mosque architecture or a stronger analysis of how mosque architecture relates to the practices of Islam, although both are represented—and/or may include minor errors that have some effect on the analysis.

2 points
Response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding of the question.
The response correctly identifies the features of the Great Mosque of Djenné that are distinctive to mosque architecture, although the identification may be implied rather than stated directly (describing what is seen rather than connecting to mosque norms). The response attempts to address how mosque architecture relates to the practices of Islam, but the discussion of that evidence is less analytical than descriptive. It may be overly general, simplistic, or unbalanced. For example, the discussion of the Great Mosque of Djenné may be mostly accurate, whereas the discussion of how mosque architecture relates to the practices of Islam includes errors that affect the response.
OR
The response correctly identifies features of the Great Mosque of Djenné that are distinctive to mosque architecture or correctly analyzes how mosque architecture relates to the practices of Islam, but not both.

NOTE. This is the highest score a response can earn if it does not discuss both features of the Great Mosque of Djenné that are distinctive to mosque architecture and how mosque architecture relates to the practices of Islam.

1 point
Response demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of the question.
The response demonstrates some general familiarity with the issues raised by the question by discussing features of the Great Mosque of Djenné that are distinctive to mosque architecture and/or how mosque architecture relates to the practices of Islam. However, the response is weak, overly descriptive, and/or contains significant errors.

0 points
Response demonstrates no discernible knowledge or understanding of the question.
The student attempts to respond, but the response makes only incorrect or irrelevant statements about the Great Mosque of Djenné. The score of 0 points includes crossed-out words, personal notes, and drawings.

— This is a blank paper only.
Question 8

During the last 50 years, many artists have addressed the relationship between technology and how people experience the world. According to artist Nam June Paik, “Our life is half natural and half technological.” Paik has also commented, “Skin has become inadequate in interfacing with reality. Technology has become the body’s new membrane of existence.”

Select and clearly identify one work of art created after 1960 C.E. that addresses the relationship between technology and how people experience the world. Your selection may be a work in video, photography, or installation, as well as a work in any other medium. Making specific reference to both Paik’s words and your selected work, analyze how your example addresses the relationship between technology and how people experience the world. (10 minutes)

Background

This question asks students to select and clearly identify a work created since 1960 C.E. that addresses the relationship between technology and how people experience the world. To answer the question successfully, students must think critically about Paik’s words and how they relate to contemporary art. The intent of the question is to prompt students to analyze how statements made by an artist are visually expressed in work created during the same period.

Since 1960, artists across the globe have increasingly embraced new technologies as tools, materials, and subject matter. Nam June Paik, the Korean-born artist working in the United States who is quoted, was a pioneer in the promotion and use of electronic art, including video, audio, television, and other media. Paik’s work is specifically concerned with how television both records and shapes human experience in the 20th century, in particular TV Buddha (1974) and Electronic Superhighway: Continental U.S. (1995). In TV Buddha, an antique Buddha statue watches his videotaped image on the screen opposite, collapsing past and present and foregrounding the encounter between Eastern transcendentalism and western technology. Electronic Superhighway: Continental U.S. explores the relationship between technology and human experience through the literal lens of television sets. Paik transports viewers into the work through closed-circuit cameras, transforming them into participants as they watch themselves “interfacing” with his technologically driven work.

Tony Oursler has also explored the phenomenon of how technology “has become the body’s new membrane of existence” through work such as Multiplexed (2008), an enormous fiberglass sculpture of a cell phone that produces fragments of disjointed conversations; the sculpture includes an image of an index finger resting on the keypad and a changing screen. In Multiplexed, Oursler appears to comment on how technology has become the method by which people “touch” the world. Other good examples include Matthew Barney, Krzysztof Wodiczko, Adrian Piper, Bill Viola, Jenny Holzer, Bruce Nauman, and David Em. Artists active in earlier decades also addressed the relationship of technology and how people experience the world. In Marilyn Diptych (1962), Andy Warhol addressed the relationship between technology and how people experience the world by mass-producing a headshot of the iconic actress in a manner reflecting the replication and selling of a celebrity commodity in film and television. In Untitled Film Stills (1977–1980), Cindy Sherman commented on the cultural creation of contemporary female identity both in and by the cinema by posing in different roles and settings reminiscent of stereotypes seen in films. Howsoever the topic is approached by artists, it is clear that the changes wrought by technology on the landscape of human experience have become a profound subject for debate, inquiry, and exploration.
Two Tasks for Students

1. Select and clearly identify one work of art created after 1960 C.E. that addresses the relationship between technology and how people experience the world.

2. Analyze how the selected work addresses the relationship between technology and how people experience the world, making specific reference to both Paik’s words and the selected work.

Points to Remember

This is essentially a contextual question that addresses not only the relationship between technology and how people experience the world, but also the relationship between words and images.

To answer the question successfully, students will need to identify, at least in general terms, a relationship in the work of art between technology and how people experience the world. Students will need to show how the artist addresses this relationship as opposed to discussing how the artist uses technology to create the work.

Students do not have to discuss a work by Nam June Paik. Work by any artist in any medium is acceptable, provided the work addresses a relationship between technology and how people experience the world and was created after 1960 C.E. Students are prompted towards choosing a work executed in video, photography, or installation, but can also choose examples from architecture, film, or other media.

Students must engage with both Paik’s words and the selected work, although the connection may be implicit. A response that fails to do both is not fully answering the question. The highest score a response can earn if it does not discuss both is 2 points.
Scoring Criteria

4 points
**Response demonstrates thorough knowledge and understanding of the question.**
The response clearly and correctly identifies a work of art created after 1960 C.E. that addresses the relationship between technology and how people experience the world. Making specific reference to both Paik’s words and the selected work, the response analyzes how the work addresses the relationship between technology and how people experience the world. The response may include minor errors that do not have a meaningful effect on the analysis.

3 points
**Response demonstrates sufficient knowledge and understanding of the question.**
The response correctly identifies a work of art created after 1960 C.E. that addresses the relationship between technology and how people experience the world. Making specific reference to both Paik’s words and the selected work, the response analyzes how the work addresses the relationship between technology and how people experience the world. However, the response may be somewhat unbalanced—with a stronger analysis of either the selected work or Paik’s words, although both are represented. It may include minor errors that have some effect on the analysis.

2 points
**Response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding of the question.**
The response identifies a work of art created after 1960 C.E. that addresses the relationship between technology and how people experience the world, though the identification may be implied rather than stated directly. Making reference to both Paik’s words and the selected work, the response discusses how the work addresses the relationship between technology and how people experience the world, but that discussion is less analytical than descriptive. It may be overly general, simplistic, or unbalanced. For example, the discussion of the selected work may be mostly accurate, whereas the discussion of Paik’s words includes errors that affect the response.

OR
The response discusses how the work addresses the relationship between technology and how people experience the world, but the response does not engage with Paik’s words in even a general way.

**NOTE.** This is the highest score a response can earn if it does not discuss both Paik’s words and the selected work.

1 point
**Response demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of the question.**
The response demonstrates some general familiarity with the issues raised by the question. However, the response is weak, overly descriptive, and/or contains significant errors. If the response identifies an appropriate work, then there is no other discussion of merit.

0 points
**Response demonstrates no discernible knowledge or understanding of the question.**
The student attempts to respond, but the response makes only incorrect or irrelevant statements. The score of 0 points includes crossed-out words, personal notes, and drawings.
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