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>2012</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

Paper One

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

Candidates performed well in this part of the examination. Good detail was provided and a clear understanding of the aspects of inquiry was demonstrated. Candidates showed progress in the development and detail of their ideas, as well as critically reflecting on the research process. Other observations include:

- **Question 1** — Candidates needed to be more specific about how the inquiry topic related to the theme.
- **Question 2** — Most candidates developed specific focus questions related to the topic and theme rather than generic questions.
- **Question 3 and Question 5** — More work needs to be done when responding to these questions. Candidates needed to offer a range of perspectives to meet the Research criterion “A” standard.
- **Question 6 and Question 7** — Candidates needed to ensure the second part of the question was addressed in their responses.
- **Question 8** — Responses were mostly very good.
- **Question 9** — Responses needed to demonstrate candidates’ understanding of “critical reflection”.

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

Candidates generally did well in this part of the paper, with knowledge and information centred on an argument that clearly responded to the selected question (all candidates responded to the question on Egypt). Although not explicitly required, it would have been beneficial for candidates to have mentioned issues such as reliability of sources in terms of aiding the validity of their own arguments, especially as the question on the Battle of Kadesh (Qadesh) opened up the issue of bias and validity of Egyptian sources regarding the “success” of the battle. Other observations are as follows:
• The question invited candidates to refer to both Egyptian and Hittite sources in developing an argument about whether the battle was a success and why the peace treaty was signed.

• The use of sources or reference to primary sources is essential in responding adequately to the question.

• Establishing historical context by referring to key dates is encouraged, as is specific mention of key individuals in the conflict.

• Quality responses identified discrepancies with the Egyptian view of the battle, why this might be so and provided potential explanations for the signing of the peace treaty.

**Paper Two**

**Extended written response to historical evidence**

Candidates demonstrated good knowledge and understanding of the key aspects and groups contained within the Spartan constitution or the role of women in Spartan society. Candidates should not, however, automatically agree with set questions. The key is to engage with the question throughout, and draw out the subtleties and complexities contained within it. Thus, candidates needed to focus on the power conflicts that existed, especially between the Kings and the Ephors. If candidates had also considered chronology (which nobody did), they would have realised that power was tipped towards the Ephors to begin with, but the Kings got the upper hand later in Sparta’s history. With regard to Spartan women, at first appearance they seemed to have more power but they were still slaves and cogs in the totalitarian Spartan system. Some candidates drew subtle differences between the concepts of “power” and “influence” which was an excellent way to approach the question.

Some of the key points in achieving highly have been listed in previous assessment reports, and are repeated here:

• use direct quotations from a range of sources

• critically use sources (do not just summarise)

• use sources in conjunction with your own historical knowledge

• make explicit use of unseen sources.

The limited use of unseen source material this year was disappointing, and a determining factor in why there were no Very High Achievement (VHA) grades awarded.

The other disappointing aspect was the lack of author evaluation and the importance of this in understanding and determining issues of reliability of information and sources. When the seen sources are published four weeks before the examination, candidates should research the authors as well as analyse the sources.

**Sample solutions**

The following candidate responses are of A or B Standard. They have been reproduced exactly as written and, therefore, include any spelling or grammatical errors made by candidates.
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 Ancient History Senior External Syllabus 2008).

Part A refers to an inquiry topic of your own choosing based on Theme 1 of the syllabus: **Studies of political structures (excluding Greek options)**. The regional area you choose in Part A must be different from the regional area you choose in Part B.

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

Suggested time allocation: **1 hour 15 minutes**.

Write the topic you selected for inquiry during your study:

The Principate of Augustus

---

**Question 1**

Comment on how your inquiry topic highlights some of the important elements of Theme 1: **Studies of political structures**.

Rome was the ancient world’s superpower for nearly a thousand years and during that time, demonstrated two distinct forms of political structure: the Republican and the Imperial... Augustus provided the link between the two systems.
Question 2

List the five initial focus questions that you used to guide an investigation into your topic, based upon the aspects of inquiry below:

i. Definitions:
   What were the significant features of the Republican and Imperial political structures, and what changes brought about the changes from one to the other?

ii. Sources:
   Among the many primary and secondary sources for this period, why are the "Res Gestae" of Augustus and the "Annals" of Tacitus the most valuable?

iii. Backgrounds, changes and continuities - motives and causes:
   The so-called "break down of the Republic" occurred over the first century BCE. What happened that caused the transformation from Republic to Empire?

iv. Effects, interests and arguments:
   Why did the transformation of Rome from a small city-state in 753 BCE to world power 30 BCE require a change in political organisation and was this change as radical as generally supposed?

v. Reflections and responses:
   How successful was Augustus in making changes that were to form the basis of Rome's political structure that was to last for another 400 years?

Question 3

With what historical sources (both archaeological and text) did you begin your initial investigation? Name actual authors, collections (including internet resource sites) and primary and secondary sources that are relevant to the topic.


Question 4

After the completion of the initial stage of investigation, what key research question did you develop and what was your initial hypothesis?

Key research question:

Did Augustus restore the Republic in 27 B.C.E. as he indicates in the "Res Gestae," when he claims to have transferred the political power of Rome from his control to that of the Senate and the People of Rome?

Initial hypothesis:

Augustus' achievements in restoring Rome into a republic were praised by the entire population. Whether he did in fact transfer all of his newly found control to the Senate and People of Rome is another question altogether. For now, Augustus remains as the "restorer of the republic," a position he most definitely succeeded in.
Question 5

Describe the plan that you used to guide your research over the next stage of investigation.

In your response, refer to:

- time frames (including drafting process)
- where you researched the topic
- the types of sources and resources considered that offer a range of perspectives.

Present this information in an appropriate format of your own choosing, such as a dot point summary, flow chart (visual organiser) or spidergram.

**TIME ALLOCATION:**

60% - planning, researching and drafting.
30% - final writing
10% - critical reflection, analysing and editing.

**RESEARCH:**

Begin with class discussions followed by library research and examination of class text books. At home, use internet sites like "Wikipedia" and watch DVDs/tapes such as the History Channel's "The Empires" series.

Study the autobiographical entries of the "Res Gestae" by Augustus and Tacitus' criticism of the Principate, whole arguments on the topic (both for and against) balance some of the self-serving and biased claims made in the "Res Gestae".

**START OF WRITING:**

In 27 BCE Octavian emerged as the sole ruler of the Roman world having eliminated the last serious threat to his position - Marc Antony. Now he accepted the title of Augustus and set about transforming Rome into the glorious city that would match the later magnificent accomplishments the world had ever seen.
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.

A key challenge is one brought up by Tacitus, who states how difficult it is to ascertain the actual truth of the issue from ancient primary sources. He points out that as Augustus’ rule became increasingly monarchical, the general knowledge of events and the thinking behind them became less obvious. Also, as the personality of Augustus ensured that contemporary writers would flatter him while he was alive and vilify him when he was dead. To overcome this challenge, you can carefully analyze and evaluate the works of later writers, dealing with the same subject area.

Question 7

How did you revise and refine your initial focus questions and hypothesis? Clearly show the development of your ideas.

Focus questions:
Augustus may not have restored the Republic but there is no doubt that from 27 B.C.E. to 14 A.D., he brought peace, order, and good government to the Roman world. The question then remains as to just what Augustus achieved that caused the Senate and the whole people of Rome to hail him as “Pater Patriae” – father of his country.

Hypothesis:
Despite the view of a modern observer (e.g., Easton) that Augustus “restored and transformed the Republic,” Augustus’ later claim “to having liberated the Republic from the tyranny of a faction” is nearer the truth.
Question 8

Define “critical reflection” in the context of historical inquiry.

Critical reflection is the re-evaluation of initial ideas in the light of revelations and perspectives of the opinions and facts revealed in various sources.

Question 9

Give examples of your critical reflection on your sources and on choices you had to make about the direction and emphasis of the research process.

The direction and emphasis was conditioned by the following important considerations.

Paterculus supported Augustus’ claim of restoration. So why would Sevinius, Tacitus, and Cassius Dio deny this? Tacitus clearly understands Augustus’ methods and his reasons for keeping hold of some basis of his power which rested on his personal wealth, control of the army, and his leading role in both the Senate and the Assembly.

The last word should rest with Cassius Dio, however, who states that although Augustus enjoyed a partnership role with both the Senate and the Assembly, there is no doubt as to who was the senior and that “nothing was actually done that did not please Caesar.”

End of Part A
Part B — Extended written response to an unseen question

Part B assesses Communicating historical knowledge (syllabus criterion 3).

The following questions are derived from Theme 5 of the syllabus: Studies of conflict.
The regional area you choose in Part B must be different from the regional area you choose in Part A.

Respond to one question in 600–800 words.

In your response, refer to and evaluate historical evidence including specific sources.
Planning space is provided. Cross out any draft work that is not to be assessed.
Suggested time allocation: 1 hour 15 minutes.

Either

Question 1 — Egypt

If the Battle of Kadesh (Qadesh) was such a resounding success for Ramses II, why did he make a peace treaty with the Hittites?

or

Question 2 — Rome

“Hannibal’s defeat in the Second Punic War had more to do with Carthaginian weaknesses than Roman strengths.” Assess the validity of this statement.

or

Question 3 — Mesopotamia/Asia

Was the use of “fear” and “terror” by the Assyrians more a function of propagandistic image than military reality?

or

Question 4 — Medieval Europe

Was the outcome of the Battle of Hastings more to do with Harold’s weaknesses than William’s strengths?

End of Part B

End of Paper One
In about the fifth year of his reign, Ramses II decided to recapture the fortress city of Kadesh from the Hittites. Kadesh was strategically important as it bordered the surrounding mountains, making it easier to watch for an enemy attack. After a lengthy but victorious battle, Ramses returned home. Due to his failure to actually capture the city of Kadesh. After sixteen years of warfare, Ramses signed a treaty with the Hittite king forming one of the strongest and most successful alliances in history. Ramses' 'success' in the Battle of Kadesh was, in fact, nonexistent. Therefore, the resulting peace treaty was a strategic move resulting in much praise for the Pharaoh.

When the Egyptians set out to capture Kadesh, they did not expect the following outcome. Wild chaos and disorder spread through the divisions of Egyptian soldiers as the Hittites, who knew they were coming, descended on their enemies. Ramses and his soldiers, who were up in front, were surprised. When they were suddenly attacked by Hittite soldiers that had been lying in wait for them. Many of his soldiers fled in fear, leaving the pharaoh surrounded by his enemies. Fortunately, Ramses held them off long enough until his reinforcements arrived.

In the end, the Battle of Kadesh would be described as a technical victory for the Egyptians (as they defeated the Hittites in battle), but a strategic loss (as they were not able to gain control of Kadesh). Ramses returned home, devastated and was soon forced to reassert his power and authority in...
Egypt. This led to a number of military campaigns, building projects, and sixteen years of warfare against the Hittites.

Finally, realising that this competition was a stalemate, Ramses signed a peace treaty with the king of the Hittites, Hattusili III. The treaty said that whenever one nation called upon the help of the other due to inside rebellion or outside attack, the other was to come. The treaty formed a strong friendship between the two nations which was later cemented by the marriage of Hattusili eldest daughter to the Pharaoh, Ramses.

The treaty allowed both nations to become strong and powerful and feared by smaller enemies that tried to penetrate their forces. It was an important and strategic advantage for both nations considering neither one had actually defeated the other beforehand.

Combined with his building energy, Ramses’ military success led him to become one of the greatest Egyptian pharaohs in history. His successes were so great that all nine pharaohs after him adopted his name as their own. This was the highest form of homage and it was unlike anything the Egyptian world had ever seen.

On temple walls and inscribed on tablets, the Pharaoh, Ramses the Great...is depicted victorious in all wars...and hailed by his people for the magnificent feats he achieved in his lifetime.

Following the unsuccessful turnout at the Battle of Kadesh, Ramses spent the next sixteen years fighting...his greatest enemy...
Hittites...A tiresome, blood-thirsty...and...unchanging...war...that...
resulted in the...signing...of...a...peace...treaty...and...the...beginning...of...
a...strong...and...successful...friendship...that...worked...well...for...
both...nations...The...battle...of...Kadesh...was...a...resounding...Egyptian
victory...but...a...strategic...loss...in...that...Kadesh...remained...untouched.
The...subsequent...peace...treaty...with...the...Hittites...was...a...remarkable
achievement...that...earned...the...Pharaoh...much...praise...and...the...title,
"Ramses...the...Great."
Paper Two

Extended written response to historical evidence

Paper Two assesses *Forming historical knowledge through critical inquiry* and *Communicating historical knowledge* (criteria 2 and 3 of the Ancient History Senior External Syllabus 2008).

Paper Two relates to your *study of Ancient Greece: Sparta from Theme 3 of the syllabus: Studies of power*.

Read all the texts in the historical sources book before responding to one of the following questions in **600–800 words**.

You must use a range of seen and unseen sources and reference them in your response. The referencing of sources can refer to the source letter/number or the author. It is important to use the sources critically, not just summarise them.

Clearly indicate the sources of any quoted or paraphrased ideas.

Planning space is provided. Cross out any craft work that is not to be assessed.

Suggested time allocation:
- studying the sources: **30 minutes**
- planning and writing your essay response: **2 hours**.

**Either**

**Question 1**

"The intent of the Spartan Constitution was to divide and balance power between various groups — kings, ephors, gerousia, and the apella. In effect, though, it was the ephors who exercised real power and dominance over all other groups in Sparta." Assess the validity of this statement.

*or*

**Question 2**

"The secret to the success of the Spartan Constitution was the harmonious relationship between all elements, in which aspects of kingship, oligarchy and democracy were beautifully combined and peacefully coexisted with each other." To what extent do the sources justify this statement?

*or*

**Question 3**

Some ancient and modern historians have claimed that Spartan women enjoyed considerable freedom, influence and power. Are these false assumptions?

**End of Paper Two**
An evident in Source D sparta's constitution was regarded as a mixture between three main forms; monarchy, aristocracy and democracy, represented respectively by Kings, the Gerousia and the Ephors, led by the Ephors. This essay will focus on an interesting question that despite this 'mixed constitution', it was only the Ephors who exercised real power and they dominated over all other forms of Sparta. While the Ephors had an incredible amount of power, they often betrayed the responsibility to work for the Apsilia, in a democratic fashion, to oppose the desires of both the Kings and the Gerousia. All three levels of power will be analysed, in particular, the role the Kings and Gerousia played with respect to the relationship with the Ephors.
According to Source G, Sparta’s Monarchy had little power in a domestic fashion. However, the kings were very well regarded, and acted more as permanent generals. In Source H, Jones alludes to the weight a successful king would have on the Apella. Although there was no decree of law, they carried importance over an entire lifetime that common Ephorality found hard to compete with. Source J details the account of the Spartan King, Agesilaus. As previous kings had feuded with the Ephors and Generals alike, instead of battling these men, Agesilaus cultivated their friendship. “From all the time that he appeare to be honouring and exalting the dignity of their office, he was unconsciously increasing his own authority, and strengthening the power of the kingship through the paceship which he attained to himself.” Source J describes an event in which King Cleomenes usurps the position of ephor whilst also being king, by killing four of the five Ephors and ordering 80 citizens into banishment. This was an extreme case, but it proves that the kings were not timid or too shy to ruffle some feathers, sometimes working outside of their normal duties.
Source A provides information about the Gerousia.

"Its members were not responsible to anybody, and formed the highest courts of justice."

The Gerousia represented the oligarchic part of Spartan Society. They were part of the Noble Families, and presumably had vested interests in a lot of domestic policy. This dangerous combination is backed up by Source E, which states (of the ephors): At these
changed annually, theirs was not a personal authority.

They were the powerful tools rather than the masters of the system, and the old men of the Gerousia were the questions of the tradition. This power over the ephors was an important part of the constitution. Source B outlines a scenario where the 20 elders, taking the side of the kings when it was a question of reining democracy and alternatively strengthening the people to avoid the development of a tyranny. The Gerousia acted as mediators between the kings and the people, and as such held incredible power in their own right. In this sense, the Gerousia, in fact, held quite a lot of power over the ephors, even if they rarely expressed it.
The ephors had vast powers, source D exemplifies this in style rather than despotic monarchs or presidents of gymnastic games, at the first sign of any transgression they inflicted chastisement without warning and without hesitation. These incredible domestic powers were filling considering an ephor could only serve for a year in office and needed to have executive power to keep the Apella in equal standing in power. Source 6 describes the extent to their power, with the ability to murder the king with a form of capital punishment. However as Source K alludes to, the result that very poor men often find themselves elected to an office where their indignation lose them again to bribery. Although the ephors had incredible power through the constitution, they were often subjected to the follies of normal men, something both the Greeks and the Kings knew.
Whilst on the surface the Spartan Constitution appeared to have well-defined roles, there were always exceptions to the rules. Whether it be the king seeking favours of the Gerousia, playing the role of the Ephors by seeking favours of the Apella, or the Apella by seeking favours of the Ephors, this system found strength in gray areas of government, and therefore, the Ephors did not hold dominance over the other classes, although they did have enormous amounts of power.