### Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of candidates</th>
<th>VHA</th>
<th>HA</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>VLA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Paper One

**Part A: Reflections on the research inquiry process**

Candidates’ focus questions related to the topic and were generally developed quite well. Some candidates needed to develop better focus questions based on definitions and sources. Candidates also needed to link questions 2, 4 and 7 more closely, and provide more evidence that their initial focus questions and hypothesis had been revised and refined. Question 6 was poorly understood and responses were generally poor. Responses to Question 8 demonstrated a good understanding of “critical reflection” but this needed to be extended to Question 9 where specific examples were required. Overall, the major concern was the misplaced focus by candidates in providing specific content detail about a particular subject rather than reflective qualitative comments on the nature of the research process itself.

**Part B: Extended written response to an unseen question**

This part of the paper caused difficulty for some candidates, especially those who were not fully prepared for the examination. Some responses consisted of only a few sentences which makes it difficult for candidates to demonstrate their knowledge. The prepared nature of some responses was obvious but it is the candidate’s ability to adapt their historical knowledge to the specifics of the question that is a defining feature of Part B. Good historical knowledge was evident in many candidates’ responses. Markers are aware that candidates have to prepare for four topics in this part of the paper but only respond to one. However, candidates should have noted various key words in the questions (such as evaluate, assess, importance, nature) and structured responses around them (especially for questions 2 and 4). Also, a more balanced approach to the topic selected would have led candidates to better argument and critical analysis of the topic. Although not explicitly required, it would have been beneficial for candidates to have touched on issues such as reliability of sources in terms of aiding the validity of their own arguments.

To ensure that responses are comprehensive, prospective candidates should demonstrate their knowledge of possible arguments for and/or against the question selected, giving clear reasons for their decisions.
Paper Two

Extended written response to historical evidence

The majority of candidates responded to Question 2, which required a high degree of comparison and contrast amongst various tyrants. In general, this was not done in sufficient depth and detail. The best responses used source material to improve the quality of arguments. Most candidates did not take the opportunity to evaluate sources, especially Herodotus and Aristotle. For example, to evaluate Herodotus’ position on tyranny (Question 3), candidates needed to know something of Herodotus himself. This information, in conjunction with the sources, helped create a better understanding of the topic and therefore better argument. Some candidates may have benefited by responding to a different question.

Four essential points that would assist in gaining a good result were listed in the 2009 Assessment report for Ancient History. They are repeated below:

- use direct quotations from a range of sources
- use sources critically (not just summarise)
- use sources in conjunction with your own historical knowledge
- make explicit use of unseen sources.

The use of unseen sources in particular demonstrates the candidate’s ability to think on their feet and adjust responses accordingly to the new material. It is the most discerning of the features of assessment that truly test a candidate’s higher-order thinking skills. This was a key element in the differences (in terms of quality) between candidates’ responses.

Where candidates could improve is in the evaluation of motive of authors, both primary and secondary (but particularly primary), as to the reasons for their opinions on topics. Note in particular the descriptors of the criterion Forming historical knowledge through critical inquiry:

- perceptively interpret values and motives and identify perspectives, while acknowledging the time period and context of the production of a source
- evaluate the relevance, representativeness, likely accuracy and likely reliability of sources.

These are the key descriptors that differentiate the 2008 external syllabus from the previous one.

Sample solutions

The response that follows was selected from those scripts that met the A Standard in all criteria in both papers. It has been reproduced exactly as written and therefore includes any spelling or grammatical errors made by the candidate.
Part A — Reflections on the research inquiry process

Part A assesses your understanding and experience of Planning and using a historical research process (criterion 1 of the 2008 senior external syllabus for Ancient History).

Part A refers to an inquiry topic of your own choosing based on Theme 4: Studies of archaeology (from the syllabus).

Suggested time allocation: 1 hour 15 minutes.

Respond to all questions. The amount of space provided for each response is an indication of how much you are expected to write.

Write the topic you selected for inquiry during your study:

Schliemann's excavations at Mycenae

Question 1

How does your inquiry topic exemplify Theme 4: Studies of archaeology?
Comment on how this topic highlights some of the important elements of the theme.

Heinrich Schliemann's excavations at Mycenae are a landmark of modern archaeology. He is considered by some to be the "father of archaeology" and study into his groundbreaking approach to the field is crucial to our understanding of it. He pioneered unorthodox methods, generated significant public interest and uncovered "Homier Age of Heroes".

Question 2

Develop five initial focus questions that could guide an investigation into your topic, based upon the aspects of inquiry below.

Definitions: Define and differentiate between established archaeological methods; how were Schliemann's considered unorthodox?

Sources: What primary sources offered corroboration to the theories Schliemann developed based on Pausanious' travel guides?

Backgrounds, changes and continuities: motives and causes: Given his social and cultural context, how significant did Schliemann change the way the world saw archaeology? To what extent did his influence future generations of archaeologists such as Arthur Evans in Crete and Howard Carter in Egypt?
Effects, interests and arguments: Given he had no real academic or professional background in archaeology, how were his methods received by the authoritative figures in his field and the country (Greece) he operated in? Reflections and responses

To what extent can we credit Schliemann's findings at Mycenae to our understanding of the Classical Greek civilisation that succeeded it?

**Question 3**

With what archaeological and historical materials will you begin your initial investigation? (Name actual authors, collections and primary and secondary sources that are relevant to the topic.)

**PRIMARY SOURCES:** Linear B lists. Only

**B.C.E.**
- ANCIENT SOURCES: 3rd century Roman travel writer Pausanius,
  5th century Greek Historian Thucydides, 8th century Greek epic poet Homer who inspired Schliemann's passion for archaeology.
- ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOURCES: Schliemann's own observations and accounts (mid to late 19th century), Prof. A.J.B. Wace (early to mid 20th century), George Mylonas, Mycenae and Mycenaean Age (1966)


After the completion of the initial stage of investigation, develop a key research question and provide an initial hypothesis.

**Key research question:**

How significant has Schliemann's presence, following his excavations at Troy and Mycenae, been in a historical and archaeological context, but also in the social and cultural framework he operated in?

**Initial hypothesis:**

Schliemann not only revealed to the world definitive evidence of the Greek Bronze Age - Homer's Age of Heroes, but he did so by pioneering unorthodox archaeological methods and championing the ancient world in a revolutionising self-publicist fashion.
Question 5

Devise a plan to guide your research over the next stage of investigation.

In your response, refer to:

- time frames (including drafting process)
- where to research
- the types of sources and resources to consider that offer a range of perspectives.

This information can be represented in an appropriate format of your own choosing, such as dot point summary, flow chart (visual organiser), spidergram.
Question 6

Select one key challenge or opportunity that you encountered in the research of your chosen topic. Explain how you dealt with this challenge or opportunity.

Are Schliemann’s excavations overshadowed by the severe criticisms on his methods and integrity? Some of the secondary sources use emotive and therefore possibly biased language, in their view of Schliemann — a range of these are necessary in gaining an objective perspective on his impact on modern archaeology.

Question 7

Revise and refine your initial focus questions and hypothesis, clearly showing the development of your ideas.

Focus questions:

- What are the ethics of Schliemann’s methods, considering the controversial nature of his archaeological excavations?
- Linear B lists are the only primary written source. How have secondary and consequential archaeological excavations of Mycenae corroborated and extended Schliemann’s work?
- How indispensable has Schliemann been to our modern understanding of archaeology and its value? Would the discovery of the Mycenaean sites been inevitable without him?
- How can the possible damage during Schliemann’s excavations be justified by its outcomes? What is the value of his findings?

Hypothesis:

Despite the heavy criticisms and, at times, regrettable public handling, the value of Schliemann as the “father of archaeology” is undeniable. He paved the way for a new wave of public interest and more extensive continuation of archaeology. This reaffirmed the value of ancient history to modern humanity and was achieved through his rigorous pursuit of the romantic “Age of Heroes” that Homer had instilled in Schliemann’s mind during his youth.
Question 8

What is your understanding of "critical reflection"?

Critical reflection is essential to the development of my ideas and hypothesis during my investigation. It involves the re-appraisal of my initial focus questions and allows a more objective and mature approach to the range of sources I have explored. It will ensure a higher level of fluency and clarity in the expression of my ideas.

Question 9

Give examples of where you have critically reflected on your sources and on where you had to make choices about the direction and emphasis of the research process.

My focus questions became more refined and interested in the ethics and necromancy of archaeology by the modern world. My essay would have more emphasis on the relevance of archaeological findings to this context than I had initially thought.

It is important to consider the controversies surrounding Schliemann's handling and respect, or lack thereof, for various authorities. Although this might have dramatised and therefore heightened interest in his excavations - he did reject the highly-regarded archaeologist appointed by the Greek govt. in the wake of his being criticised for the 'panicking' of the sites at Troy in modern day Turkey. Secondary source allow us to ascertain the impact of this and therefore gain a more developed understanding of how Schliemann should have handled Schliemann's findings made a broad distinction between it the earlier Minoan civilisation of Crete and the progression of it through the war-like Mycenaean society (indicated by ancient illustrations on objects) to the Classical Greek age that emerged from 800 B.C.E. — documentation from Schliemann's findings and the historical significance Schliemann's use of ancient literature validated its value as a historical source - it was previously seen only as myth.
The second Roman civil war fought between Octavian and Mark Antony and Cleopatra marked the definitive progression of the Roman State from oligarchic republic to autocratic Empire. The relationship between Octavian and Antony is fundamental to the series of events that led to Octavian's victory and consequent position as Roman emperor. The alliance that developed in the second triumvirate and the achievements it made were a necessary condition for the victory.

In the wake of Caesar's assassination in 44 B.C.E., his will declared his heir to be his great nephew Octavian. This came as a surprising declaration to Mark Antony, his constant right-hand man during his political career. Octavian was therefore given the rights and title of "son of the divine Julius Caesar. This was the marking of the start of a brilliant and enormously important political career. There was, however, the natural alliance between Antony and Octavian that was formalised in the Second Triumvirate in 43 B.C.E. Their relationship mirrored the personal and political relationship between Pompey and Caesar in the First Triumvirate seventeen years earlier. The third member of the
The first task of the Second triumvirate was primarily for Antony and Octavian to avenge the death of Caesar. This was executed at the Battle of Philippi in 42 BCE where, united, they defeated and murdered Brutus and Cassius. This was the major achievement of the second Triumvirate and demonstrated the extent to which Antony and Octavian had in common, in terms of their individual political ambitions.

Following this success, the alliance of the Triumvirate dispensed with Lepidus; Antony and Octavian had the means to pursue their political aspirations. They divided the Roman spheres of influence; with Octavian in Rome at the west, and Antony based in Alexandria, Egypt. Here, Antony became increasingly influenced by his lover and companion Cleopatra, who was to be the last Pharaoh of Egypt.
Although he had never personally accomplished militarily success, Octavian demonstrated political ingenuity and resourcefulness that was to guide his remarkable career. He understood the established Senate and had learned through observation the failures of Caesar’s career, which he was significantly influenced by. Octavian acquired the will of Antony through his influencing a Roman, national who was closely associated with Antony’s operations in Alexandria. Octavian proceeded to reveal this to the Roman Senate—his appeal to Rome’s political insecurity at the exoticism and threat of Egypt in unmasking Antony’s political intentions. Antony was to leave a significant portion of the Roman Empire to Cleopatra and her children.

Upon learning of Antony’s betrayal, the Roman Senate declared war on Cleopatra and by implication Antony. Octavian had used his political judgment and alliance with the Senate to extreme success. The betrayal occurred on a personal level as well—Antony had married Octavia’s sister. The strategic advantage rested with Rome who closed in on the lovers and concluded at the Battle of Actium where Antony and Cleopatra were forced to commit suicide.
After this second Roman civil war, the Roman people were prepared for a system of government that they weren't in 44 B.C.E. - a dictatorship. The Senate and the people - connected with the rule national identity exemplified with SPQR, saw the value of an autocratic system of government. In the past, Rome had been weakened by the 1 year consulship tradition and lack of continuity. Octavian represented the strength and quality of a leader who could unite successfully as the figurehead of Rome's expanding empire. At the end of the second civil war, Octavian emerged as sole ruler and so began his 11 year reign as Rome's first 20th century Emperor, one of the most powerful empires in history.
In the majority of the modern world, tyranny and democracy represent opposing systems of government. Names like Hitler and Stalin are so polarised in modern connotations that they pass as crucial to understanding how they have become so polarised in modern connotations that they pass as crucial to understanding how they have become culturally synonymous with the word “tyrant” and “democracy” respectively. The story of ancient Greece presents two very different political systems: tyranny and democracy. In the 5th century BCE, Athens was the centre of democratic politics. Athens was a city-state, and its citizens had the right to participate in its politics. The Assembly was the highest form of government, and its decisions were binding on all citizens. The Council of Five Hundred was responsible for the day-to-day running of the city-state, and the Treasurer was in charge of its finances. In contrast, Sparta was a monarchy ruled by a king and his sons. The king was the ultimate authority, and his decisions were binding on all citizens. The Council of Elders was responsible for the day-to-day running of the city-state, and the Treasurer was in charge of its finances. The main difference between Athens and Sparta was in their approach to politics. Athens was a democracy, and its citizens had the right to participate in its politics. Sparta was a monarchy, and its king was the ultimate authority. The Athenians believed in the idea of democracy, and they believed that it was the best way to govern a city-state. The Spartans, on the other hand, believed in the idea of monarchical government, and they believed that it was the best way to govern a city-state. In conclusion, the story of ancient Greece presents two very different political systems: tyranny and democracy. Athens was a democracy, and its citizens had the right to participate in its politics. Sparta was a monarchy, and its king was the ultimate authority. The Athenians believed in the idea of democracy, and they believed that it was the best way to govern a city-state. The Spartans, on the other hand, believed in the idea of monarchical government, and they believed that it was the best way to govern a city-state.
It represented an extremely slight and out-of-touch minority who were oblivious to the struggles of the middle and working classes. Their right to govern was asserted from a political monopoly and enabled by their control of the law and religion, and their possession of military strength. As the colonial movement and subsequent change in economic power occurred, these Greek aristocrats of the early 7th century were unable to contain the 'animal' they had neglected - the mass of lower classes. The Age of Tyrants, that succeeded was necessary in overthrowing this irrelevant system of government.

Democracy itself could not have seized power in this period. As a political ideology, it does not have the same 'violent revolution' that such a dramatic change of government requires. Tyranny generally has received unfavourable treatment by historians who may have sympathy for the old aristocratic system or bias towards democracy. Tyranny was, however, a necessary means to an end in Ancient Greece. The brutal and harsh examples of ancient tyranny that are often cited need to be judged relative to A. Andrews recognizes that the criticality of tyranny of Gyselius of Corinth, "overthrew... a harsh, oppressive and unpopular aristocracy", and
was, in fact, "well-liked" (Source M). It should be noted that by various sources, tyranny is considered to be one of the most short-lived form of governments" (Aristotle, Source D). It is generally not considered to be an end, rather as an interim between the breakdown of the old, unsatisfactory system of government, and before the establishment of a new form. 

There are obvious risks in tyranny that make it unsustainable as a system of government. It is defined by the way in which power is seized, and not by any characteristic of political thought. Tyranny is born out of the desperation of conditions and is therefore specific to a particular time. The tyrant is not elected, rather he seize power by recognising the stagnant period his state has settled in, and represents the people. Tyranny is a reflection of a specific period of time and is consequently beneficial in that it temporarily ends class conflict, and provides society with a new direction and momentum. The positive outcomes of tyranny in Ancient Greece are exemplified by the careers of Orthagoras, Pisistratus and even the ruthless reign of Cypselus and his son, Periander. The downfall of tyranny lie in its room for abuse of power at the
hands of various tyrants' personal political will.

In the case of democracy, tyranny can be seen as the means through which it is achieved. Unlike tyranny, there is a strong set of values associated with it; "people were free to speak and power was controlled and balanced" (Source A).

In the 5th century, Athenian democracy developed by Pericles used the tyrant as its political antagonist. This was another sense in which tyranny was a necessary part of the development of democracy. The 4th century philosophers Aristotle and Plato vehemently disapproved of tyranny, but their views must also be accepted within their own historical context. Whether it is seen as part of the same cyclical process or as a means to the ends (presumably as democracy), tyranny must be recognized as necessary for the existence of democracy.

It is a prevalent view in modernity that tyranny and democracy represent binary oppositions. This view does not acknowledge the rich political history between the two during their development in Ancient Greece. Tyranny was, and should be considered a necessary part of the political process that developed democracy.