

**CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS**

**Pre-U Certificate**

## **MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series**

### **9769 HISTORY**

**9769/21**

Paper 2a (European History Outlines, c.300–c.1516),  
maximum raw mark 90

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2014 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>21</b>

*These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.*

### **Introduction**

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and must be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners should give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They should be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit should be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of perhaps unremarkable material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners should use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It should go without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners are also asked to bear in mind, when reading the following, that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may well yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well sustained and well grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 2 mark.
- (e) The band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners should first place it in a band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the band have been met.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

**Band 1: 25–30**

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate, there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. Use of English will be clear and fluent with excellent vocabulary and virtually error-free.

**Band 2: 19–24**

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate, there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary. Use of English will be highly competent, clear, generally fluent and largely error-free.

**Band 3: 13–18**

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>21</b>

**Band 4: 7–12**

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may well be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear, although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material, but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated. Some errors of English will be present but written style should be clear, although lacking in real fluency.

**Band 5: 0–6**

The answer will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; unsupported generalisations, vagueness and irrelevance are all likely to be on show. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated, whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources is not to be expected. The answer may well be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

### Section 1: c.300–c.632

#### 1 Was Diocletian more successful in his military or his administrative reforms?

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates could refer to the ways in which Diocletian tried to make the army more effective and within budget and to his work in establishing a bureaucracy to run the Empire.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that Diocletian brought the army under stronger central control, made it into a force more capable of defending the Empire and improved its supply network. He created new legions, but probably not to the extent claimed by some Roman historians, and strengthened frontier defences with new forts, using natural barriers and building more military roads so troops could be moved rapidly from east to west as well as south to north. He aimed to pay and supply the army locally, through taxation and local requisitioning.

Administratively, he separated civil and military commands in the provinces and increased the number of provinces. Imperial officials proliferated to service the Empire and the Imperial administration on the move was a considerable logistical problem. As officials were well paid and enjoyed a privileged position, more and more tax-payers were needed to sustain the bureaucracy.

Candidates might conclude that the military reforms had the larger role in preserving the Empire.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

## 2 Was monastic evangelism the main aim of Gregory the Great?

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates could refer to the dissemination of the rule of St Benedict by Gregory and the missions that followed.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that Gregory's main work lay in his acceptance of the Benedictine Rule as established at Monte Cassino around 577. He based his own foundation in Rome on this Rule and it was extended beyond Italy by the mission of St Augustine to England, the work of Abbot Hadrian at Canterbury and of Benedict Biscop in Northumbria. Later the Rule spread to Francia and to Germany and absorbed all other Rules, apart from in Ireland.

Alternatively, he had other aims. He was a vigorous bishop of Rome, promoting improvements and good order in the city. He ensured the survival of the Papal patrimony and could be seen as the founder of the Papal States. He claimed primacy for the Papacy but was unable to persuade the Patriarchs of the Eastern Church to agree with him, while French and German rulers gave him limited recognition. He wrote letters on a wide range of topics to extend the role of the Church in a practical way and his *Regula Pastoralis* was a textbook for bishops. But these aspects were pervaded by his conviction that asceticism was the highest form of expression of Christian belief and hence monastic evangelism could be seen as his main aim, and one that he achieved with real success.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

**3 How important were military factors in explaining the decline and then the collapse of the Roman Empire in the fifth century?**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates could mention the defeats inflicted on the Empire by various invaders and the different explanations put forward for this which could include the qualities of the Emperors and economic factors.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that in essence it was the failure of the Roman armies to defend the Empire which was the main reason for its decline and collapse. The Visigoths, Ostrogoths, the Huns and the Vandals all attacked. The prefect Stilicho held them off briefly, but the general trend was of retreat.

The power and passion of the barbarian leaders, such as Alaric, Attila and Odovacer was another factor. The divisions within the Roman Empire, the rapid turn-over of rulers and prefects and the apparent chaos at times also contributed along with the inability of the financial resources available to meet the costs of defence. But the actual administration survived and was subsumed by barbarian governments.

Hence candidates are likely to conclude that the military factors were the crucial ones as both long-term and immediate causes.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

**4 How powerful were the Merovingian rulers of the Frankish lands in the years after the death of Clovis in 511?**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates might refer to the problems in maintaining the empire of Clovis after his death: divisions among the rulers, the power of the nobility and the influence of the Church.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates could argue that the Merovingian rulers after Clovis lacked his abilities. The greed of his heirs led to in-fighting and instability. The death of Chlotar in 561 had similar results, with the rivalry of the queens as well as the kings being fierce and bloody. Hence their power was often short-lived. They also suffered from the growth of a large landed aristocracy, to whom they had granted land or who had inherited lands as descendants of the senatorial classes. They gained power in local administration to the diminution of royal influence and at the centre, in the institution of the Mayor of the Palace, which would eventually signal the downfall of the Merovingians. The Church was controlled by powerful bishops who administered its rich estates and could levy certain taxes.

Alternatively the Merovingians had some strengths. Dagobert managed to retrieve some monarchical powers by resuming estates and travelling around his realm to bring justice to his subjects. The Kings ruled as absolute monarchs with control of the legal system. Administration was centred on their court and officials, but often became corrupt.

Candidates could conclude that the Merovingians had the potential to wield great power but that their quarrelsome tendencies led to their relative weakness.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.



Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

**5 Were the successes of Justinian’s reign more the result of the achievements of his advisers and generals rather than of his own work?**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to advisers such as Tribonian and John of Cappadocia and to the general Belisarius. The role of Theodora could be mentioned.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that the advisers were bound to play a large role given the size of Justinian’s empire. The law codes of Tribonian were a major achievement. The financial needs of the empire were met by the work of officials such as John of Cappadocia, whose success could be measured by the extraordinary degree of hatred towards him. Without Belisarius, spurred on by the ambition of his wife, Antonia, African and Mediterranean victories would have been fewer. Theodora had a great influence on the Emperor. Her tenacity enabled him to survive the Nika riots in 532.

Alternatively, Justinian was not a powerless puppet. Much of the reform initiative came from him and he had a zeal for good government and sound administration. The building programme in Constantinople was another of his priorities and his interest extended to his wider lands with utilities being provided throughout his empire. He was a skilful diplomat and he promoted trade and the silk industry, the products of which were often bought by the court.

Candidates could conclude, therefore, that Justinian chose men (and women) to fulfil his aims and was largely in control of what they were doing and so deserves most of the credit.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

## Section 2: c.632 – c.919

**6 What best explains the spread and consolidation of Muslim rule from 756 to 961?**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates could refer to the power of Islam, the cohesion of the Abbasids and the weaknesses of European opposition.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates could argue that Muslim rule benefited from its unity of belief and the zeal of its followers for expansion. The Abbasids had established their Caliphate in the mid-eighth century and were lucky to have a series of very able Caliphs from al-Mansur to Harun-al-Raschid. The Caliphate had a well developed administration and was ruled from its new capital at Baghdad. The Caliphs were practical men and took care to remove possible rivals within and without their family circles. In Spain, one of the provinces of the Caliphate where the rulers found some problems, notably in raising taxes, they eventually established themselves at Cordoba, with a new city at Murcia and fortresses at Toledo and Merida. Here, too, the succession passed smoothly from father to son and so harmful succession wars were avoided. Trade expanded. Cordoba became a centre of the pottery industry and the Caliphs were known as discerning patrons of art and scholarship.

Candidates could conclude that the quality of leadership was crucial in a system which was very much led from the top and events after 961, when there were succession disputes and less able rulers, indicate this.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

## 7 How impressive was the legacy of Charles Martel?

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to the position of Charles Martel as Mayor of the Palace, his military exploits and his influence on his sons, especially Pepin.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that Charles Martel was instrumental in the rise of the Carolingians and therein lies his legacy. He benefited from his father's victory at Tertry and was able, in a brief civil war, 715–719, to defeat Plectrude, his father's widow, and the forces of Neustria and rule as undisputed Mayor of the Palace in Neustria and Austrasia. He abolished the Neustrian court and so paved the way for a sole dynasty to govern Francia. He seized control of the treasure of Neustria to bolster his power. His legacy was also impressive in that he revived the practice of annual summer campaigns to expand territory and provide opportunities for plunder for the nobles on whose support his power was based. This was continued by both Pepin and Charlemagne. He never lost a war, an amazing legacy which not even Charlemagne could emulate. He kept the support of nobles and the Church. He overthrew any possible rivals and in his last years ruled without even a puppet Merovingian king, thus paving the way for Pepin in 751 and then Charlemagne.

It is, therefore, not easy to suggest his legacy was anything other than impressive. Some of his methods were undoubtedly brutal but he was a most effective ruler.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

## 8 Was there a substantial cultural renaissance under Charlemagne?

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates might refer to the intellectual and artistic achievements of Charlemagne's rule.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that there was a considerable revival of scholastic and artistic endeavour at Charlemagne's court at Aachen. One of the central figures here was Alcuin, who concentrated on *correctio* and a more accurate version of the Vulgate. Theodulf, Bishop of Orleans, Einhard and Paul the Deacon were other key contributors. They ensured that many texts, both Christian and heathen, have survived. There was historical writing and poetry. In the visual arts the Romanesque style dominated and there was some fine decorative work. Charlemagne's palace was an impressive complex.

Alternatively, this was a derivative movement. Alcuin was a sound but unoriginal scholar. The stress on *correctio* perhaps squeezed out new thinking. The discovery and copying of texts was praiseworthy but not necessarily new. There was some looking back to Greece and Rome which could be seen as a renaissance. In the arts Byzantine and Roman models were largely followed. Charlemagne's palace church was based on San Vitale in Ravenna. In illuminated manuscript production, English monasteries were the template.

Hence candidates might conclude that there clearly was a renaissance but there is more uncertainty about whether it was substantial.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 13	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

**9 'Viking attacks and devastation continued unchecked.' How valid is this view of Viking activity in mainland Europe in the ninth century?**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to the Viking attacks on monasteries, on the coasts of Francia and in the Mediterranean.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that the century does indeed seem to be one of continued destruction. The Golden Age of art and learning was brought to an abrupt halt by the sacking of monasteries like Noirmoutier. The internal troubles of the Carolingian Empire meant that defences were less well maintained and so the way lay open for the invaders. They reached Rouen, ranged south to Gascony, circled Spain and raided from Cordoba to Cadiz. In 845 they famously under Ragnar Lothbrok sailed up the Seine and burned Paris. The Danish kingdom was in disarray so there was little to restrain the raiders. From 850 to 878 they were unchecked. On landing from their ships they would seize horses and raid inland. Some monarchs paid them to go away, but they came back for more.

Alternatively, they were resisted at times and if resolutely, as in Aquitaine after 865, they went elsewhere as raids which did not yield booty were profitless in all senses. At the end of the century Rollo led a Danish force against Charles the Simple which ended in a truce and the settlement of the Northmen in what became Normandy and their eventual considerable contribution to the development of France.

Candidates are likely to conclude that the attacks of this period were unremitting and any respites were but brief, until the final years of the century.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 14	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

**10 'The decline of the Carolingian Empire resulted from its becoming defensive where once it had been expansionist.' Assess this view.**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to the events after the death of Charlemagne and the barbarian invasions. The size of the empire, the Carolingian system of inheritance and the qualities of the rulers after Charlemagne could be examples of other factors.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates could argue that once the expansion of the Empire ceased, then the booty no longer flowed and the loyalty of the nobility became strained. Hence royal lands were given away in an attempt to keep the nobles trustworthy, but this weakened the finances of the Emperors. As the Scandinavian pirates with their quick-moving fleets attacked, the Carolingians could not react fast enough with their armies and, again, it was left to local lords to mount a defence. Muslim attacks on the south and Magyars in the east were similarly successful.

Alternatively, there were other explanations. Arguably the Carolingian Empire had grown so large that it could expand no further and rulers could barely control it all. There were few means of communication across the Empire and there was no concept of a unified state among its inhabitants. The Frankish custom of dividing an inheritance among all the heirs led to division and quarrels and the nature of the later Carolingians was such that these were long, bitter and often brutal.

Hence candidates could make a good case for the statement in the question or for other factors, but may conclude there was only one Charlemagne and once he had gone then disintegration was sure to follow.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 15	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

### Section 3: c.919 – 1099

#### 11 What best explains the revival of the German monarchy after 919?

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates could refer to the factors which made for the survival of central authority in Germany, the power of the Church and the roles of Henry the Fowler and Otto I.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may suggest that royal estates were still quite extensive in Swabia and Franconia and widely scattered which gave the Crown influence right across Germany. The Church was losing its estates to turbulent laymen and saw in the Crown the possibility of a higher power which could protect them and their possessions. The Church also favoured an orderly unified state and saw monarchy as the ideal way to bring this about. When Henry, Duke of Saxony, became king of Saxony and Franconia in 919, he brought his constructive statesmanship to bear and, in addition, he had vast hereditary estates. He was able by a mixture of force and negotiation to get suzerainty over Swabia, Bavaria and Lotharingia. He built walled towns and created a cavalry force to resist the Slavs on his eastern borders. The long reign, big ambitions and large fortune of Otto I completed the process of revival.

Candidates may conclude that, although circumstances were favourable, the skills of the rulers were decisive in bringing about the revival.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.



Page 16	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

**12 'In the tenth and eleventh centuries the Capetian monarchs were surprisingly weak.' How accurate is this judgement?**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to the succession of Hugh Capet in 987 and to the subsequent reigns of Robert II, Henry I and Philip I.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that the Capetians had the advantage of being the largest landholders in France and their lands were grouped around Paris and Orleans in the centre of France and on main trade routes. Philip was able to add the French Vexin and Bourges. The rulers were able to exploit Church revenues for their benefit. Their vassals were largely loyal as they were bound by fealty to the kings, who were anointed monarchs and vassals of none.

Alternatively, they were weak. Hugh fell out with his uncle Charles which led to the expulsion of the Archbishop of Reims and then a run-in with the Papacy. Robert embarked on a war over Burgundy, only for Henry to bestow the duchy on his younger brother. They were often uneasy in a three-cornered contest with William of Normandy and the Counts of Anjou and ended up enemies of both. Philip became embroiled with the Pope over his simony, his bigamous marriage and his reluctance to prevent his barons from attacking Church lands.

Candidates could conclude either way. The Capetians had the power if they could harness it, so were surprisingly weak, but equally their incapacity could mean there was no surprise at all in their weakness.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.



Page 17	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

### 13 To what extent did Norman rule benefit Sicily up to 1101?

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to the landing of the Guiscard brothers in Sicily in 1060 and the subsequent events.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that Sicily gained as little from the Norman invasions and rule as from any other previous attempts. There was much fighting, largely with mercenaries, against the Muslims in the south, who took time to subdue and the evils associated with such warfare were rife.

Alternatively, when Roger Guiscard had defeated the Muslims and his brother Robert had returned to Southern Italy to deal with rebellious Normans there, he was able to make peace on good terms and to establish a new nobility from his mercenaries and retainers and to give them small fiefs, so they were less likely to rise against him. He was relatively tolerant towards the Muslims and based his administration on both Muslim and Byzantine patterns, enforced by a largely Saracen army. He was appointed as hereditary legate over his dominions by Pope Urban II so he was master of the Latin Church and also of the Greek. He was equally tolerant of both. When he died, leaving two young sons, his widow was able to govern as regent until Roger II was old enough to reign. This indicates that the Sicilians felt his rule had been beneficial.

Candidates seem likely to conclude that Sicily had benefited from Norman rule once the stage of conquest was over.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 18	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

**14 How important is national feeling in explaining the reconquest of Spain and Portugal in the eleventh and twelfth centuries?**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to the advances of the Kings of Castile in the reconquest and to the disunity and in-fighting among the Muslims.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that this was a movement inspired by national feeling exemplified in the career of El Cid. The Spanish Christians had improved their warlike skill and their population had increased, giving them greater resources. They had internal security and agriculture and commerce flourished. Aragon and Catalonia came under one monarch in 1140 which strengthened their position.

Alternatively, the Muslims were disunited and fought more among themselves than against the Christians at times. As they grew weaker they even appealed to their co-religionists in North Africa for aid. They were unable or unwilling to take advantage of the periods when the Christians were involved in succession disputes, as after the death of Alfonso VI of Castile and again when Alfonso I of Aragon died.

Candidates might conclude that despite the strong national feeling, it was the complete breakdown of Muslim unity that led to the reconquest, given that its progress was generally erratic.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 19	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

### 15 How successful were the Popes up to 1073 in their attempts to reform the Church?

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to the Pontificates of Leo IX, Victor II, Stephen IX, Nicholas II and Alexander II.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that the Popes enjoyed considerable success. Leo IX was a very active peripatetic Pope, who brought the Papacy to the people, raising its prestige. He held Councils and aimed to root out simony and clerical marriage. He appointed cardinals from beyond Italy to help him promote his reforms. Nicholas II decreed that Popes should be elected by cardinals to remove the influence exerted by the people of Rome and that of the Emperor. Further Councils passed a raft of decrees to establish the independence of the clergy. Alexander II was advised by Hildebrand, the future Gregory VII, and hence papal power and unsparing reform went forward together. The political role of the Papacy grew, exemplified by the granting of a papal banner to William of Normandy in 1066.

Alternatively, the papal aims were not always successful. Progress was not unresisted. The biggest failure came in 1054 when Leo's efforts to enforce the supremacy of Rome led to the lasting schism of the Eastern and Western Churches. The unseemly wrangling in 1058 after the death of Stephen led to rival Popes being chosen and a reassertion of Roman noble influence.

Candidates may conclude that the Popes made considerable progress, although their achievements may have been overshadowed by those of Gregory VII and Innocent III.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 20	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

#### Section 4: 1085–1250

### 16 What best explains Frederick Barbarossa's problems in Italy?

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to Frederick's aims in Italy, his relationship with the Papacy and the resistance he met from the Lombard cities.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates could suggest that Frederick wanted to do the impossible in Italy. He began by hoping to restore good government there but came into conflict with rival powers: the Popes and the Lombard cities and they were too much for him, given his additional concerns in Germany. When Frederick met Adrian IV and at first refused to lead the papal mule in procession, this demonstrated the clash of powers. A direct clash was looming when Adrian died. The ensuing schism resulted in the excommunication of Frederick by Alexander III, who eventually emerged victorious. They came to terms at Anagni and finally were reconciled in 1177. Frederick's diplomatic abilities meant the settlement was more favourable to him than it might have been.

As for the Italian cities they resisted fiercely, despite the consequences, as they feared complete subservience to the Emperor and loss of their independence. They especially resented Frederick taking over the provision of justice. They even abandoned their usual inter-city rivalries at times. The German states were reluctant to keep sending troops to Italy and in 1176 the Lombards defeated Frederick and he fled to Pavia.

Candidates could conclude that Frederick was trying to achieve the impossible and more so in that he aroused the enmity of two powerful groups and could not realistically hope to defeat them both.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 21	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

**17 How far were the successes of Louis VI and Louis VII dependent on the support they had from the Church?**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to the clear hereditary nature of Capetian kingship, the favourable location of their lands, the establishment of feudalism, the support of the Papacy and to the steady qualities of the rulers themselves.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that the support of the Church was important. The kings were useful to the Papacy and so avoided the enmity which other rulers attracted. Much of the administration was in the hands of clerics and Suger, Abbot of St Denis, was the chief minister until his death in 1151. The rights of bishops were upheld. Louis VII went on Crusade and though he wavered once in his loyalty to Alexander III, he gained in respect from having the Pope as his guest.

Alternatively, the kings were responsible for their successes. Louis VI worked tirelessly to reduce the power of rebellious barons and established an administration of professional officials who owed nothing to the nobility. He repelled an invasion from Germany with the help of a people beginning to show some sense of a national spirit. He arranged the marriage of Eleanor of Aquitaine to his son. Louis VII had his problems but was eventually successful in coming to live peaceably with his rival, the Angevin Henry II.

Candidates may conclude that useful though the support of the Church was, the kings, especially Louis VI, were the architects of their own success.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 22	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

**18 Assess the reasons why the French monarchy was stronger in 1226 than it had been in 1180.**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates could refer to the reigns of Philip II and Louis VIII.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that it was the abilities of the kings which chiefly explains the strengthening of the monarchy, notably the skills of Philip Augustus in increasing his territories. By exploiting his feudal rights he enlarged the area he ruled directly, which in turn led to greater revenue, which then allowed him to be more ambitious. He gained part of Flanders by marriage and then much of the Angevin empire by strategy and good fortune. Louis conquered Poitou, although his hopes of invading England successfully were defeated. Philip also established a professional bureaucracy which allowed effective record keeping and his administration was based on Paris. Local officials looked to Paris for their orders. He trebled his income as trade and agriculture prospered and he had an effective army of mercenaries and knights. His towns and castles were well fortified.

Alternatively, Philip was assisted by the errors and misfortunes of the Angevins. He was able to benefit from the feuding in Henry II's family, sheltering rebellious princes at his court. But his chief gains came in the reign of John, when all the assets which Philip had built up were brought to bear. The marriage to Isabella of Angouleme and the murder of Arthur played right into Philip's hands. He regained Normandy and most of the other Angevin lands. He defeated Otto IV, John's ally, decisively at Bouvines in 1214.

Candidates are likely to conclude that the long reign of an able monarch was the prime factor. The succession to the throne was assured with none of the rivalries that afflicted Philip's Angevin opponents.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 23	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

**19 How far was the power of the Papacy greater in 1216 than it had been in 1198?**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to the pontificate of Innocent III and his reform programme and also that of Honorius III.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that the Papacy was indeed more powerful. Innocent was an efficient administrator and formalised much of the Roman Curia. He held the Lateran Council in 1215 which made further regulations. He tried to enforce strict standards in monasteries and more papal control of bishops. He was the first Pope to levy taxes on the clergy, which gave him an independent income. In some ways these less spectacular changes were the most enduring.

Alternatively, Innocent tried to put into practice his beliefs that Popes were superior to all earthly rulers and was less successful in increasing his powers in this respect. His recognition of Frederick as Emperor of Germany came after years of civil war and the involvement of the Papacy in purely secular matters. Philip II was not cowed by threats from Innocent. Nor was King John. Both only gave in when it suited them. The Fourth Crusade, which he encouraged, was disgraced by the sack of Constantinople. He set in train the Albigensian Crusade as part of his insistence on obedience to the Papal hierarchy but the success here was the result of French intervention and had less impact on his powers. Honorius III tried to keep the peace but became entangled with Frederick II and died before achieving much progress.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.



Page 24	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

**20 'Politically skilful but lacking in principles.' How accurate is this view of Frederick II as Holy Roman Emperor from 1220?**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates might refer to the aims of Frederick II and to the circumstances which caused him difficulties.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates could argue that Frederick was indeed skilful. He was crowned by the Pope in the expectation that he would go on crusade and managed to evade this promise, although he sent aid. He managed to restore some semblance of order to Germany and tried to counter the power of the semi-independent princedoms. He kept the Imperial towns loyal by his diplomacy. When he went to Sicily he left as regent Engelbert of Cologne who governed successfully and defeated Danish ambitions in the Baltic. His appointment of his son Henry, the King of the Romans, as regent was less felicitous and led eventually to deposition, but later Frederick returned to Germany and did much to restore his power there.

But equally he lacked principles. One of his aims was to go back on his commitment to abdicate from the throne of Sicily. He defied the Pope and proceeded to reform the government in Sicily, leading to a quarrel with the Papacy and his excommunication. The outcome was his deposition by a General Council in 1245 and much chaotic conflict in Italy and Germany.

Candidates may conclude that Frederick's lack of principles outweighed his political skills as he failed to respect the Papacy or acknowledge moral factors.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.



Page 25	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

### Section 5: Themes c. 300–c. 1200

#### 21 Who gained and who lost from the introduction of feudalism in the early Middle Ages?

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to areas of Western Europe where feudalism was established.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that those who gained included monarchs, who gave land to vassals which helped to ensure their loyalty and also gained troops when they needed them. Swearing fealty to a lord was a serious matter and bound men closely in their allegiance. The vassals gained too as they acquired land from which they could derive revenue. The hierarchical society implicit in feudalism with those who prayed, those who fought and those who worked had advantages all round. The Church favoured the system as a sign of orderliness in God's creation.

Alternatively, there were losers. Peasants who had been free were now tied to the land and had duties both to perform and to pay. There was little mobility or prospect of change. As time passed the rulers found a feudal army less effective than mercenary soldiers and for some the bonds of feudalism were just that and not liberating.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 26	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

## 22 How significant were towns in the economy of the early Middle Ages?

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates could refer to a range of examples across Europe and should go beyond one country.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that in this period the agrarian economy was of greater significance but that towns were becoming more so. Many towns had been sacked in Viking raids and were rebuilt and often fortified and so became safer places for craftsmen and traders to live. Monarchs promoted the growth of towns as they could tax the inhabitants and their trading activities. Capital towns became centres of government and employment. The most significant towns were ports and the city states of Italy which may be a focus of the argument.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 27	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

### 23 What best explains the growing importance and influence of the friars up to 1300?

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates could refer to the establishment and growth of the Franciscans and the Dominicans.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that the personality of St Francis had a great impact. His personal magnetism and his romantic ideals gained him many followers. Others formulated the rules of the order and St Bonaventure tried to unite the spiritual and more ordinary elements. The order spread rapidly.

The Dominicans were founded by a far more orthodox figure. Dominic preached to the Albigensians and then asked to establish an order of preachers. His forte was as an organiser and the order put intellectual activity at the heart of its work.

The big achievement of the friars was in leading the world of learning. Thomas Aquinas was a Dominican. They revised the Vulgate. The Franciscans were the more original thinkers, exemplified by Roger Bacon.

Their other contribution was in popular preaching for which their churches were specifically designed. They compiled instructions for preachers and collections of useful examples to illustrate their points.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 28	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

**24 'They survived largely because of the disunity of their enemies.' How far is this true of the Crusader States up to 1204?**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to the circumstances in which the Crusader States were established and the situation after the first four Crusades

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that the disunity was a key factor. The Muslim rulers of Aleppo welcomed the state of Edessa as a buffer against the Zengids, and those living in Damascus, who were Shias, were pleased to see the Sunnis in Egypt, their enemy, under attack. But this did not last. Nur-ad-Din and Saladin united the Saracens and brought the Muslims together again.

Other factors could be used to explain the survival. The settlers often were on good terms with local Muslims and they co-existed and traded with each other. The States had close ties back in Europe and a supply of adventurous knight; often younger sons, came to strengthen them. They were ruled as feudal states with an efficient administration often run by local officials. After the defeat at the Field of Blood the crusaders built castles in strategic positions. The Knights Templar and the Hospitallers helped with defence after they were set up in the early twelfth century.

Candidates may point out that the kingdoms did not all survive and that disunity affected them from 1130 or so. Edessa fell to Zengi. By 1174 Damascus was in Saracen hands and Saladin took Aleppo.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 29	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

## 25 How vigorous was the intellectual life of mainland Europe in the twelfth century?

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates could refer to the development of civil law, the growth of the universities and some individual scholars such as Peter Abelard and Peter the Lombard.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that there was considerable development intellectually. The Church was defining canon law, while Roman law was reviving with studies at Bologna aimed at glossing its meaning to make it clearer. Later scholars aimed at considering how to apply the law in practice. There was also some revival of study of classical texts like Pliny and much work done by translators. Universities developed, beginning with the medical school at Salerno, followed by Bologna, Padua and Naples. In the north, Paris predominated but Orleans and Angers grew from cathedral schools.

In the early part of the century, the disputes between Nominalists and Realists dominated universities and the Schoolmen. Peter Abelard's dialectical methods outlined in *Sic et Non* were very influential despite his personal disasters, and Peter the Lombard's textbook on the topic became a standard work.

Candidates could conclude that in colleges and universities there was vigour, but that it was very much a minority interest in the society of the time.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 30	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

**26 How successfully did the Church deal with the threat from heresy in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries?**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates might refer to heretic groups such as the Humiliati, the Waldensians and the Cathars.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that the Church was generally successful. Groups of heretics might manage to survive but they had little real power.

Heretics tended to flourish when there was a strong feeling of anti-clericalism in the Church and move from this to doctrinal issues. The Humiliati in Lombardy wanted the clergy to live as ascetics and were ready to set them an example. The Waldenses in Lyon denounced the clergy and believed that the individual Christian could interpret the Bible for himself. The Cathars were the greatest threat and were linked to the Bogomils in Eastern Europe. In Languedoc they were protected by local nobles and even Raymond of Toulouse. The Church reacted with condemnation at Councils, sending preachers to convince heretics they were wrong, threats of and actual burnings and finally the Albigensian Crusade which wiped them out and devastated Languedoc in the process. Some of the repression was assisted by the French kings who had their own interests in the area. The emergence of the inquisition from the Albigensian Crusade.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 31	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

### Section 6: 1250–c. 1378

#### 27 How valid is the view that the War of the Sicilian Vespers changed nothing?

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates might refer to the events which began the war, the main participants and the outcome of twenty years of fighting.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that very little altered. Sicily itself remained hostile to the rule of the French, which had been fully demonstrated in the occurrence which began the war in 1282. Charles of Anjou was also resented for his heavy taxation, which remained a feature in Sicily. The final outcome perpetuated the rule of Aragon while the Angevins held the southern coastal region of Italy. The stable alliance of the Popes with the Angevins outlasted the war.

Alternatively, there was some change. The initial protagonists died during the war, Charles of Anjou, Peter of Aragon and the Pope, Martin IV, all in 1285. The effect on the Papacy was considerable and meant that, in pursuit of their aims in Sicily, the Popes needed support from the great Roman families, either the Orsini or the Colonna, who thus became more influential. The resignation of Celestine V in 1294 brought Boniface VIII to the throne of St Peter and he was a rather different prospect from the previous Popes, going so far as to arrest and imprison his predecessor. Candidates could conclude that the change was in externals and not in the essence of the matter.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 32	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

**28 'Louis IX's greatest achievement was to raise the prestige of the French monarchy.' Was it?**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates might refer to the role of Louis as an arbitrator, his protection of royal interests, his reduction of revolt in Languedoc and his contribution as a Crusader.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that prestige was raised in a way that built on the territorial gains of Louis' grandfather, Philip. Louis was in demand as an arbitrator as a result of his reputation, and his judgements in Flanders and England enhanced French prestige. He crusaded from conviction and prepared bravely, building the port and town of Aigues Mortes as his base. He ransomed Christian captives in Egypt and bore his own captivity with patience. On his death, miracles attended his relics very rapidly and he was canonised in 1297. Higher prestige than this is hard to seek.

Alternatively, he had other achievements. He defeated rebels in Languedoc, where the Lusignans made common cause with Henry III, and Henry became his vassal for Aquitaine and Gascony and abandoned any claim to the other former Angevin lands. This was a worthwhile settlement. He managed, wisely, to stay neutral in the conflict between the Papacy and Frederick II. His government followed the pattern set by his grandfather, but he was equally tenacious of his rights. The Parlement of Paris developed. The royal currency was so respected that he was able to extend it to the whole of France. He encouraged preachers, he built abbeys and churches, he banned trial by battle and he sent friars round France to enquire into abuses.

Candidates may decide either way or argue that all his activities enhanced French prestige.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.



Page 33	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

## 29 How successful was Boniface VIII in achieving his aims in Italy?

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to Boniface's determination to assert his own position, his wish to control Sicily, his feud with the Colonna and his ambitions in Tuscany.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that Boniface enjoyed some success. He revoked the acts of his predecessor and defined more clearly a number of Papal Decretals. He extended his family holdings in the north of Rome to try to build a stronger power base. He allied with the Caetani family for the same reason and drove their rivals, the Colonna, from their lands in Tuscany, forcing them to flee into exile. In 1300 he declared a Jubilee for pilgrims and so attracted large numbers to Roma, enhancing his popularity with Roman shopkeepers.

Alternatively, Boniface was less successful in Sicily, where he was much resented and the Sicilians rejected James of Aragon once James deserted to the Papal side. His attempt to seize control of Florence using Charles of Valois was another failure, leading incidentally to the exile of Dante and Charles had no more success in Sicily. His final failure was due more to his policies regarding France when he was captured at Anagni by Nogaret, Philip the Fair's minister, but the French were aided by the Colonna. The French were expelled by the Orsini but Boniface died soon afterwards.

Candidates could conclude that over a wide range of policies Boniface did succeed but not in the areas which mattered most to him.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 34	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

**30 'The Mongols were a serious threat to the established order of Medieval Europe in the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.' Discuss.**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates might refer to the incursions of the Mongols into Hungary, Moravia, Poland and Russia.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that where the Mongols penetrated total devastation followed, but that, for various reasons, but primarily because they turned their attention to Asia and especially China, they were not, in the end, a serious threat.

In Hungary the established order was completely destroyed by the Mongols and the reign of Ladislas II saw total collapse. The patriarchal kingship in Hungary was already in trouble as the kings gave away too much land and became poorer, while the nobles extracted from the monarchy the grant of privileges known as the Golden Bull. Mongol chiefs and some Hungarian nobles ended up ruling small parts of the country. In the Czech lands only Moravia was attacked by the Mongols. Elsewhere in these lands there was constant warfare and rivalry between the princes from which the Habsburgs eventually emerged as victors. Hence here the Mongols were not a serious threat and order was gradually established. In Poland there was great devastation and the Teutonic knights were weakened by defeats, but the Mongols moved on rapidly and Poland recovered and prospered with an influx of German settlers. Politically the failure of the princes to resist the Mongols led to the rise of a powerful noble class as the rulers needed to propitiate them with grants of land, leading, again, to a new order being established. In Russia the impact was greatest with a long subjection to the Mongols and the imposition of a punitive poll tax. The Great Khan, Kublai, moved on to China and his empire became more thoroughly Asiatic. After a period when the silk route was closed, merchants and missionaries re-opened it and the old order returned.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 35	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

**31 'The Italian city states in the fourteenth century experienced almost continuous political anarchy.' Discuss.**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to various of the city states but Venice, Genoa and Florence are likely to predominate.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that war was often present but that merchants and bankers, nevertheless, flourished so its impact was not that disastrous.

Both Venice and Genoa faced problems. Venice was involved in war on the mainland to ensure her grain supplies and in 1358 lost Dalmatia. Genoa suffered from internal disputes and more so from the war with Venice over the Levant, which merged into the war of the Byzantine Emperor against his son, in which they took opposite sides. In 1379–80 Venice came under siege but then strong leadership from the Doge allowed them to turn the tables and besiege the besiegers and emerge the winner. Both were adversely affected by the long wars and Genoa never really recovered and became a French protectorate. Venice, however, with a sound government was able to regain her power. Florence was engaged in war to get control of Lucca, which failed and some of the bankers like the Bardi faced bankruptcy. War with Pisa followed. Guelf and Ghibelline rivalries rendered Florence disorderly and chaotic, while the Free Companies, under leaders like John Hawkwood, ravaged the countryside, leading to a war with the Papacy which was blamed. The insurrection of the Ciompi brought further havoc in 1378–82, after which the oligarchs regained power and Florence gradually recovered. Smaller cities like Siena and Pisa suffered far more.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 36	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

## Section 7: c.1378–c.1461

**32 What best explains the economic importance of the Italian city states in this period?**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: their major role in commerce and banking, extensive manufacturing expertise, the way in which the merchant class was socially dominant; their quality municipal government which was flexible and responsive to needs; a good education system and civic pride; the fact that Milan was on a cross-roads of trade routes, had iron ore resources and a good agricultural base; Venice, for example, was the international trader and entrepot, and controlled much of the Arab trade; there was an extensive shipbuilding and carrying trade which helped domination of Mediterranean markets; an effective guild system which was not a hindrance to development and innovation.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. It is unlikely that one specific point will dominate. A range of factors is looked for and the ablest will differentiate and prioritise. Those that manage to explain why there was such a widespread influence, both in the Mediterranean and beyond, as well as further North into Europe, should be rewarded. The focus should not be just on the internal reasons for growth and development.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 37	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

### 33 What best explains the fall of Constantinople?

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the military and administrative skills of the Ottomans, vital for keeping an army in being; extensive divisions within the ‘European’ opponents of the Ottomans; Greek/Byzantine incompetence and neglect; the main Ottoman focus had shifted from East to West with consequent concentration of resources; the total failure of Union of Florence to have any real effect; the traditional split/rivalry between Roman Catholic and Orthodox; the utilisation of cannon by the Ottomans; c.7000 defenders versus c.80 000 attackers; the old treachery argument.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Identification of the key factors with reasons why they were the ‘key’ factors and why others were of lesser importance is looked for. There is, as always, no ‘right’ answer, but a careful weighing up of what the candidate considers to be the principal reasons with effective reasoning and good supportive detail is what is looked for.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 38	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

### 34 Assess the nature and extent of the threat Hus posed to the Roman Catholic Church.

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: whether the focus should be on him before or after his death; the way in which he became linked to Bohemian nationalism; the fact that four crusades were needed to repress the movement after his death gives an idea of the strength of the movement; perhaps the Hussites were more dangerous than Hus himself; the Four Articles of Prague and their implications; the issue of whether he was more dangerous when linked to military leadership of Zizka and Prokop; the Hussites were internally weakened by faction fighting, the Utraquists versus the Taborites; in theory it was all sorted by 1436, yet still an issue in the late 15<sup>th</sup> century; the longevity of ‘dangerous’ ideas, such as freedom of preaching, ideas on communion and lay control of the Church.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The best will look first at the nature of the threat, what form it took, and whether it was the man himself or the ideas he advocated that were the real or assumed threat to the Church and state. The point about whether his specific ideas were important, or whether they were only dangerous when linked to wider forces such as nationalism or anti-clericalism. A picture of ‘extent’ is also needed, and should be dealt with separately, and it could well be argued that the threat was more imagined than real, and that a crass response created a much more serious problem than it actually was.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 39	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

**35 'The nobility was always the most serious problem faced by the Valois monarchy in this period.' Discuss.**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: threats, possibly the English; general factors such as particularism, internal divisions and desire for local autonomy; there was institutional chaos usually present; there were always individual monarchs themselves, who were flawed, bar Charles the Wise; plenty of the nobles, such as Anjou, Berry, Orleans, and Burgundy were serious problems; population decline and devastation caused by war did not help; the tax exemption of nobles was a real issue as were private armies; the lack of a standing army for the monarch.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. There is a good case to be made either way, but on balance the nobles, or factors linked to them such as tax exemption and private armies, might be the most popular answer. However, there were other very important considerations which need to be raised in the case 'against', ranging from the inevitable English to personal incompetence. Given the inheritance and local traditions, it would need someone quite remarkable to rule in any way effectively.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.



Page 40	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

**36 Was military strength the main reason for the expansion of Muscovy in this period?**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: it was the key factor, but simple valour and a talent for treachery were also important; the ability to get good cooperation with the Khans of the Great Horde; the sensible patronage of the Orthodox Church added religious backing to the cause; internal Mongol problems helped Muscovy ‘break away’; the growing economic strengths, self-sufficiency plus potential exports; there were talented ‘land acquirers’ such as Basil I who had political guile as well as military ability; the growth of the city of Moscow into a respectable looking ‘capital’ helped.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Certainly military ability was a factor, but the quality of rulers was also a factor, they were a great deal more than good fighters – Basil 1 is a good example of this. The decline of the Mongol overlordship was also a major factor as was religious endorsement. The growth of a real centre could also be considered.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.



Page 41	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

## Section 8: 1461–c.1516

**37 What best explains why Italy was the focus of so much diplomatic interest and military conflict in the later fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries?**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the amount of cash and commerce, there was a lot of wealth there; ability to gain control of the Church/Papacy; the aggressive tendencies of rulers like Louis XII and Francis I; the tendency towards papal involvement in international politics; the Spanish imperial aims, Ferdinand and Naples, for example; the militaristic activity of Popes like Julius II; the role of Maximilian; the intervention of the Holy League, Henry VIII, for example; it was the early stages of Habsburg-Valois rivalry; and the role of Charles V as Holy Roman Emperor which was to play a part.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The best will identify the primary reasons and argue why they and not others are more important. There is no one ‘right’ answer, but careful consideration of what are identified as the key factors and why this conclusion is reached is what is looked for. Those who manage to give serious consideration to the ‘so much’ aspect of the question should do very well, but it is unlikely that any attempt to challenge it will be successful.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 42	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

### 38 How important a role did Burgundy play in international politics between 1461 and 1515?

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the degree of autonomy from France till 1477; its wealth and commercial influence; its overall strategic position in that part of Europe; the role of balance of power factors – with England in particular; the alliances with England and Brittany; the ability and aspirations of Charles the Bold and Philip the Good; they were quality administrators and diplomats.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. A clear analysis of the importance of Burgundy's role is looked for. Its significance is obvious and the reason for it needs to be considered but it is the nature of the role that is looked for and whether it really was a central factor in international relationships in the period.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 43	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

### 39 How effectively did the Papacy deal with the challenges facing it in this period?

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered, (and there is a wide range to choose from) are: nationalism, secularism, the legacies of the Schism and Conciliarism; money—its raising and spending; general anti-Papal sentiment; the wide range of ecclesiastical grievances: invasion of Italy, the Turks, Humanism and Luther to name but some; the role of individual Popes and organisations .

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. There are a wide range of challenges to consider and a variety of different reactions to them – or even ignoring them. The best will probably consider what ‘effective’ might mean in this context, and while the consensus will probably focus on ‘badly’ the extent of it needs to be considered. There should be a genuine attempt at balance.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 44	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

#### 40 How unified was Spain by 1516?

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the nature and extent of the actual unification process; the degree of territorial consolidation; the support by the nobility for a unified Spain; the degree of administrative unity/consistency; the attitude towards the monarchy; the relationships between the monarchy and the Cortes-Council of Castile; the degree of religious orthodoxy and the attitude of the Moslems and Jews; the implications of the conquest of Granada.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Some definition of what the criteria are for a ‘unified’ country is looked for, the extent to which it is simply a matter of drawing lines on maps or whether a great deal more is involved, such as a common language or religion or degree of acceptance of the political and constitutional situation. The extent to which people felt ‘Spanish’ could also be considered.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 45</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>21</b>

#### 41 Assess the contribution of Ivan III to the rise of Muscovy.

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: his becoming Lord of All Russia; the development of imperial emblems, raising the whole status of rulers and state; the absorption of other areas such as Novgorod; by 1500 taking Smolensk and the advance on the Dnieper; the building of the Kremlin; disposing of the Tartars, but keeping the best of their financial, political and military methods; he was an able diplomat, especially in moves to the E and SE – Lithuania; his developing contacts with the West and his employment of engineers, architects, gunners etc.; arguably he was the real founder of Russia.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. A weighing up of the overall contribution is what is looked for. How much might be merely superficial and how much was critical to the emergence of Russia as a major geographical feature, as well as a major political and international force, is expected. The focus should be on the ‘rise’ – the evolution – of Russia.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 46	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

### Section 9: Themes c.1200–c.1516

#### 42 To what extent did the cult of chivalry reflect the practice of the period?

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates could refer to the ideals of chivalry, the development of knightly orders and the role of heraldry.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that chivalry was embodied in the order of knighthood, whose members were expected to be models of courage and courtesy, generosity and faithfulness and to protect the weak, especially ladies, and defend the Church. The training of an esquire and then a knight did reflect the skills they would need in battle. The foundation of the chivalric orders such as the Bath and the Garter in England, the Golden Fleece in Burgundy and St Michael in France were useful in allowing monarchs to reward some of their chief supporters very cheaply. The heralds, in authorising the coats of arms to be worn by knights, performed a useful role in assisting identification in battle. Some famous knights, like William the Marshal, deserved their fine reputations.

Alternatively, the theory of chivalry outran the reality. Courage and skill in arms were useless in many battles. At Agincourt the knights were mown down by archers. The heavy armour made it difficult for unhorsed knights to get up again. Professional captains were more intent on providing for their troops than on protecting damsels in distress. The Hundred Years War particularly illustrated this.

Candidates may conclude that the harsh reality was different from the romances, but the sense of honour linked to knighthood did survive, exemplified in Froissart's Chronicle, and the feudal class of the period was less lawless than earlier in the Middle Ages.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 47	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

**43 ‘Gothic art was for the rich and no – one else.’ Assess this view.**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates could refer to architecture, sculpture and painting, notably of illuminated manuscripts.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates could argue that the art was largely paid for by the rich and so reflected their tastes and interests, but that buildings and sculptures, especially, were there for all to see and the whole population was able to view and worship in the churches.

The evolution of Gothic Art in Northern France depended to an extent on the skill of the craftsmen, who were far from being rich. As design moved towards naturalism, the builders and sculptors were reflecting the world around them from putting their enemies on gargoyles to recording farmyard scenes on misericords. As the period wore on, statuary representations of figures became more realistic and even on tombs began to show traces of character, which, again, was not just for the rich to appreciate. The use of colour, now sadly gone from most buildings, and in churches of stained glass, much better preserved, could be enjoyed by all who visited the edifices.

Alternatively, the production of illuminated manuscripts in monastery scriptoria was more for the rich. The designs often featured detailed observation of nature and of daily life and some of the artists were not rich, but the context and the surroundings in which they worked were. Masterpieces like the *Tres Riches Heures* of the Duke of Berry could only be enjoyed by the courtly class. At the close of the period, painting in the Netherlands became more reflective of classes who were below the very rich, but even so, the *Arnolfini Portrait* shows a wealthy merchant couple.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 48	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

#### 44 How successful was the conciliar movement?

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates might refer to the Councils which met at Pisa in 1409, Constance in 1414, Pavia in 1423 and Basle in 1431.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that the conciliar movement had a number of successes. The great Schism was ended. John Hus, a dangerous heretic in the view of the Church, was condemned as such and burnt at the stake. Regular meetings were agreed. After the Hussite revolt an agreement was brokered with the Utraquists. The Council of Basle attempted reform in the teeth of Papal opposition and even suspended Eugenius IV. There was some diminution of Papal taxation.

Alternatively, the Popes succeeded in preventing any real reform which would dilute their powers. The rivalries of the groups at the Councils were such that little could be achieved. The ending of the Great Schism occupied the first two Councils. The Council at Pavia only met because of the agreement to hold Councils regularly and its only real decision was that the next should be at Basle. The Council there was divided again and a splinter group met at Ferrara. Eugenius IV failed in his scheme to reunite the Western and Eastern Churches, and the Council, now moved to Lausanne, dissolved itself in 1449 when Nicholas V became Pope. National interests triumphed over the need for Church reform.

The whole focus of the movement, that conciliar power representing the whole Church was superior to Papal power, was defeated by Papal machinations, but survived to become an issue at the Reformation.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.



Page 49	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

**45 To what extent was the fourteenth century a period of rapid change in rural society?**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the impact of the plague on rural populations and to the longer term effects, economic, social and political.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates are likely to suggest that the immediate impact of famines, such as the Great Hunger and especially the plague and the ensuing depopulation, had an immediate effect on labour and prices, but also medium and longer-term effects on social structures, patterns of land tenure, and the dynamics of power within communities that some historians regard as ‘feudal’. In Scandinavia, France, Germany and Italy the result effect of the plague was amplified in towns and villages, in some cases reducing the relative importance of urban or semi-urban centres in favour of rural areas, but also disrupting trade networks such as the cloth trade, and reducing demand for grain, which further depressed land values, in some cases enabling formerly landless labourers to acquire property.

However, responses may also discuss evidence that alterations to the societal structure and forms of land tenure were limited, affected relatively few, and that traditional power structures remained or recovered within a relatively short space of time.

Responses may discuss the, mostly indirect, impact of warfare on rural communities, such as the raising of rents in France to contribute to the Hundred Years’ War. The extent to which demographic change caused the popular unrest of the period in regions such as Flanders in 1323–28 and Italy (1378) and the *Jacquerie* in France (1358) has been debated. Similar evidence regarding the continued impact of the Church as a spiritual and temporal power in rural areas can be discussed. Distrust in the Church during the period of the plague is tempered by evidence of land acquisition and continued popular piety that strengthened the Church’s influence within rural communities. Thus candidates may recognise that the impact is difficult to measure as it was so variable and also affected by other factors.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 50	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

**46 'Keeping alive the crusading ideal was the only redeeming feature of the fifteenth-century Church.' Discuss.**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the grim picture normally there – usual abuses of nepotism etc.; the background of the Schism; at least awareness of need for reform; perhaps support for renaissance ideals; over-involvement in wars at home and abroad; the decline of the reputation of the papacy; the treatment of Savonarola; the conciliar movement; the rise of national churches; see 'In Praise of Folly'!

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates should be able to rise above writing a list of all that writing was wrong. It may well be that the 'bad' side gets emphasised, but there should be a real attempt to evaluate any issues that merit credit.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 51	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	21

**47 To what extent was the desire to make money the motive behind overseas exploration in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries?**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the personal interests of rulers – e.g. Henry the Navigator; the desire for religious reconquest; the missionary spirit, crusading; commercial expansion and colonial acquisition; the general spirit of the age – Renaissance curiosity; the work of individuals like Diaz; the need for settlement and concerns about overpopulation; gold, slaves and status.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The cash incentive needs to be balanced against a variety of other factors such as status and a genuine worry about overpopulation. Religious motives were certainly there, but the extent to which they were propaganda for more mundane reviving forces could well be debated.

**AO3** [not applicable to Outlines]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.