

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 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 2013 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	21

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 demonstrated.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	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.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	21

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 answers 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 2013	9769	21

Section 1: c. 300–c. 632

1 How successful was Diocletian's rule of the Roman Empire?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the introduction of the tetrarchy, restructuring the administration of the Empire, reorganising the army, economic reform and the persecution of the Christians.

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 Diocletian set out to solve the problems which faced the Empire arising from the threats of military challenge. The setting up of the tetrarchy was his solution and it worked effectively in his reign. He reduced the size of the provinces and separated the administration of civil and military matters. In the army different divisions were responsible for defence of the frontiers and as more mobile units. This allowed more flexible responses to any threats. A more regulated society emerged. Alternatively, the tetrarchy was short lived, efforts to deal with inflation by limiting prices were unavailing, while the persecution of the Christians was declining even before the end of the reign and Constantine totally reversed it later. Candidates might feel that the fact that Diocletian paved the way for the reforms of Constantine, so that it can be difficult to ascribe precise responsibility for some measures, means that he was something of a 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 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	21

2 How important were economic problems to the decline of the Roman Empire in the fifth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates should make some substantial reference to economic problems. They may refer to other explanations such as the structure of the government, the personal qualities of the Emperors, declining control of the army, problems in defending the frontiers and the incursions of the barbarians.

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 suggest that problems over food supplies, reduced profits from war, declining tax revenues and a drift from towns all contributed to the economic downturn faced by the Empire. Alternatively they are likely to argue that it was the military situation which was the key factor. The real power was exercised by a series of military dictators such as Aetius. The lack of functioning armies in central Italy allowed the attacks on Rome by Attila and the Vandals. Sea-borne invaders found Italy at their mercy. In the end it was the impossibility of mounting a defence which brought the Empire down. The Huns, Goths and Vandals exploited the situation to the full. In addition Rome had delegated more and more power to the localities and then could not retrieve it.

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 2013	9769	21

3 Assess the strengths and weaknesses of Gregory the Great as Pope.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates can refer to the reforms made to the patrimony of St. Peter, charitable work, efforts to reform the Frankish church, the defence of Rome, Gregory’s writings and his conversion of the English.

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 are likely to argue that Gregory’s pontificate had far more strengths than weaknesses. He increased the wealth of the church, spending much of it on the care of the poor and in public works. He was responsible for stepping in when the secular authority failed in both administration and defence, since the church had the necessary systems and personnel in place. He encouraged a settlement with the Lombards as the only practical solution. In his mission to England under Augustine he had the blueprint for future provincial organisation with two provinces and the archbishops answering directly to the Pope. His *Regula Pastoralis* became a medieval text book for bishops. His less successful policies included his failure to bring about reform of the Frankish church, firmly under the control of the rulers and to convert the Lombards to Christianity. He could, perhaps, be blamed for blurring the distinction between secular and ecclesiastical government, but probably this was not a matter of choice.

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 2013	9769	21

4 How is the success of the Merovingian dynasty in Gaul best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the various Merovingian rulers from Clovis onwards and their achievements.

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 quality of the leadership of the rulers was often decisive with examples such as Clovis in Northern and Western France and later the conquests of Dagobert. The Merovingians produced heirs who were reasonably adept. Clovis became a Christian and this extended his power. He also made a sound marriage. Even when the empire was divided among various sons of the previous ruler, they acted together against invaders. But candidates could suggest that they were not that successful with the divisions in the kingdom, the endless assassinations of rival heirs and the activities of some power-hungry women. Eventually their nobles outdid them with the role of the Mayor of the Palace becoming dominant.

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 2013	9769	21

5 How valid is the view that Justinian achieved little domestically?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the methods of government employed by Justinian, his law code, his means of raising taxation and his religious policies.

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 Justinian was determined to root out corruption in the administration and in particular to end the confusion about exactly what the law was. Hence he empowered Tribonian to draw up the *Codex Justinianus* with its *Digest* and *Institutes* published to help students. Provincial government was simplified and order was restored in Constantinople after the Nika riots. Justinian's building programme, crowned by St Sophia, was extensive and successful. Trade was developed. But alternatively, the empire was never adequately financed as Justinian's bold aims outran his purse. The extortions of John of Cappadocia were finally checked, although he had done much to increase revenue, but other officials continued to exploit the poor and defenceless. The corruption weeded out earlier returned and as he grew older, Justinian's resolve crumbled. Earthquakes and plague made matters worse. Hence the conclusion is likely to be that his permanent achievement was small, but that at times in his reign he made his empire a much better place in which to live.

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 2013	9769	21

Section 2: c.632–c.919

6 To what extent did Arab successes in the seventh century depend on their military superiority?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the advances of Islam after the death of Mohammed, the lack of financial resources to stem this and the quality of the early Caliphs.

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 Christian defences against the Arabs were ineffective. The Byzantine Empire lacked men and money and had alienated the Arabs by harsh taxation and persecution of non-Christians. Egypt was similarly disaffected and the untimely death of Heraclius left his army demoralised. Alternatively, the Arabs were well led by Abu-Bakr and later by Omar. Despite some internecine strife, the Omayyads emerged victorious and established their rule. The administration left by the Romans was often harnessed by the Arabs. Religious fervour gave them added strength. Candidates might conclude that misgovernment in Arab lands was as vital as the appeal of the well-organised Arabs. The Copts in Egypt and other groups in the Empire had little loyalty to Byzantium and thought new masters might be more desirable and this often proved to be the case.

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 2013	9769	21

7 'Little more than a ruthless conqueror.' How adequate is this description of Charles Martel?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might refer to the advances made by the Franks under Charles Martel and to the way in which he governed his extensive territories.

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 continuous fighting in which Charles Martel was engaged supports the statement. As the Mayor of the Palace for Austrasia, he had first to establish control of Neustria. He brought the peoples east of the Rhine back under the influence of the Franks and 'punished and subjugated' them according to one chronicle, thus showing he could be ruthless. But his conquest of Aquitaine was more a matter of luck in that Eudo needed his help against the Arabs and together they won a decisive victory at Poitiers in 733. After Eudo died, Charles returned and completed his conquest. His assimilation of Provence followed a similar pattern. He did not gain the nickname Martel or Hammer by sitting quietly at home. Alternatively, there were limits to his power. From his base in north-eastern France he could not rule his entire realm directly so gave lands to supporters to build up his own governing party. He tried to stem the southward movement of the Saxons but often had to compromise with them. His rival Mayor of the Palace in Neustria resigned but had to be maintained by Charles. The church required his devotion and he encouraged missionaries. He was buried at Saint-Denis as a reward for his support. But he turned a deaf ear to papal pleas for aid in Italy. He enforced the laws and issued decrees to help develop some loyalty towards himself and his Carolingian dynasty. Candidates might conclude that, in the end, it was Charles Martel's reunification of the Frankish Empire that was his main achievement, laying the foundations for his illustrious grandson.

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 2013	9769	21

8 ‘Charlemagne should be remembered more for his cultural and educational achievements than for his conquests.’ Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the areas conquered by Charlemagne and assess how permanently they were affected. His encouragement of learning and patronage of culture can also be evaluated. Candidates may suggest their own criteria for judging Charlemagne’s success.

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 conquests of Charlemagne were what really defined his empire. The early overcoming of the Lombards simply set the tone for the rest of the reign. It also allowed Charlemagne influence over the papacy. The Saxons gave more trouble but were eventually defeated and converted. Tassilio of Bavaria was forced to become a monk and his lands annexed. His one great failure was in his attempt to conquer Muslim Spain. His empire became famed as a successor to that of Rome and a precursor to that of Napoleon. Alternatively, Charlemagne’s lasting impact on his world came from his cultural achievements in keeping alive the remnants of ancient European civilisations. His desire for an educated clergy led on to his educational programme in the palace school and in many monasteries. Caroline minuscule had a widespread effect. Scholars he recruited, such as Alcuin, improved the quality of Latin texts. Roman monuments were respected and copied in his efforts to recreate ancient Rome. Thus candidates may conclude that the more extensive impact came from the cultural renaissance, but that the conquests allowed settled government in the central part of the empire in which the arts of peace could flourish.

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 2013	9769	21

9 'The success of the Vikings owed more to the unpreparedness and weakness of those they attacked than to their own strengths.' How far do you agree?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the campaigns of the Vikings, notably against the Frankish lands.

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 Franks were politically divided and so unable to resist the Vikings. Charlemagne's empire had become a collection of kingdoms and many of the reigns were short and ineffectual. The Vikings established themselves on islands in the Seine and Loire which the Franks found difficult to capture. Later Charles the Bald was unready and unprepared for Viking attacks and after his death the Vikings benefited from further dynastic disputes. Alternatively, the Vikings were a difficult enemy to defeat. Whatever made them leave Scandinavia, they had strong motivation in their attacks. They often acted almost independently of their kings and so could not be restrained by treaties. When paid off, they simply came back for more with a renewed strength. It was only after they had looted much of the accessible wealth of the river and coastal areas that their decline began. Some were converted to Christianity and others, notably Rollo, accepted what was to become Normandy, as a reward for protecting France from other marauders, a true poacher turned gamekeeper. Hence candidates may conclude that the Vikings were determined foes and much stronger opposition than that provided by the Franks who found them quite a challenge.

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 2013	9769	21

10 How far were German rulers from 843 to 919 weakened by problems over the succession?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the ways in which the German succession was enforced and the problems this caused, and to 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 may argue that the succession was a real weakness in Germany at this period. The Treaty of Verdun in 843 broke up the Empire of Charlemagne and this led to endless strife. The interests of the nobility often lay in prolonging, rather than truncating, such dissension. Lewis the German suffered from attacks from his relations who ruled Francia. Eventually all the kingdoms began to choose their own rulers. Alternatively, the church intervened with the Popes often seeking a protector in Germany. Sometimes invasion of Italy proved fatal for monarchs and their ambitions. Emperor Charles III was ineffective in all his realms, causing further weakness. The lack of effective central authority led to the break-up of the empire and much disruption and disorder. Thus candidates could conclude that the troubles of Germany were rooted in the essentially divided nature of the lands and for one ruler to hold Germany together was too much to ask. Emperors like Charlemagne were rare creatures.

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 2013	9769	21

Section 3: c. 919–1099

11 ‘Surprisingly strong.’ How convincing is this judgement on the Capetian monarchy by 1108?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to rule of the Capetian monarchs such as 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 one factor helping the Capetian was the settled succession and also the length of the reigns of Henry and Philip. They were adept at taking advantage of favourable circumstances to extend their territories, such as disputes within the ruling families in Anjou and Normandy. They had the moral backing of the church, even if some of their own morals were more dubious and they fiercely protected their rights of appointment, disregarding papal cries of outrage. Thus their strength could be seen as not that surprising. Alternatively, there was much to suggest they were not especially strong and this was to be expected. They were often little more than one among many provincial dynasties. Henry I became embroiled with William of Normandy from which he derived no benefit at all. The depredations of petty barons on royal estates reduced income. Philip I made trouble for himself by abducting the wife of the Count of Anjou and marrying her bigamously. Thus candidates could conclude that the Capetians were just lucky to survive, rather than possessed of much essential strength.

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 2013	9769	21

12 'More successful as a statesman than as a warrior.' Is this an accurate assessment of Roger II of Sicily?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the reign of Roger II and to his relations with the Papacy and the subsequent warfare in Italy. His governmental reforms could also be discussed.

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 Roger II was a successful statesman. In 1130 after rendering assistance to one of the claimants to the Papacy in a schism he was crowned as King of Sicily in a considerable coup. He was a man of culture and his court was modelled on that of Byzantium. He introduced a series of legal codes. His civil service was one of the most advanced in Europe. He had great wealth, derived largely from trade, rather than feudal revenues and protected his trading routes jealously. He preferred alliances and diplomacy to fighting, notably when under pressure from another planned papal attack. He was tolerant when he came to rule over Muslims. Alternatively, his military achievements were not unremarkable. His navy was carefully nurtured as so much of his power depended on it. He defeated invasions by papal armies, although at times he had to retreat to the island of Sicily. He conquered parts of North Africa and even seized Corfu and Rhodes briefly. Candidates might conclude that Roger was a man with many strengths who left a powerful and advanced autocracy, but that he had aroused enmity among most of his neighbours, which suggests he was less of a statesman than the question indicates.

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 2013	9769	21

13 To what extent can the reconquest of Spain and Portugal in the eleventh and twelfth centuries be explained by Muslim weaknesses?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the various rulers of Spain and Portugal in this period and their gradual reconquest of the area as well as the divisions among the Muslims and other problems they faced.

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 Muslims were weakened by the dissolution of the Caliphate of Cordoba and its replacement by a number of petty principalities, often hostile to one another. Seville, Granada and Malaga fought among themselves, thus allowing the Spanish to take advantage. Some were forced to pay tribute to the Spanish to stay in power. In 1139 Alfonso I was able to defeat the weakened Muslims and become king of Portugal. Alternatively, the Christians had assets of their own. Although independent of the Crusades, the reconquest was similarly inspired. Bands of adventurers from France reinforced the native armies and the Counts who held land in Southern France were eager to assist, if largely for their own ends. Leadership was an important factor, especially in the early stages where the legendary el Cid was involved. The Christians were able to rely on internal security and advancing output in agriculture and commerce to assist their efforts. Their population had also increased. Candidates could also point out that the Christians were not always united themselves and there were periods of civil war, but the Muslims seemed too disunited to take advantage.

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 2013	9769	21

14 How extensive were the achievements of Gregory VII?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the aims of the Pope and the degree of success he enjoyed in carrying them out.

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 aimed to extend the control of the papacy over the church and over the whole of Christendom and that he was totally convinced this was his divinely-inspired purpose. He saw himself as solely responsible to God and all others subservient to him. They may then suggest that such extreme claims could never be achieved in medieval Europe. Gregory's attempts to force the German bishops to wipe out simony and clerical marriage met with resistance and little action. His further Investiture decree, attempting to halt the investiture by laymen to church offices, hit at the accepted privileges of kings to appoint and invest bishops in their churches. His use of excommunication on recalcitrant bishops and then even on the Emperor, led to Henry's submission at Canossa. This was the high point for Gregory. In his later years he made a poor decision in declaring Henry deposed and paid for this when Henry appointed an anti-Pope who duly crowned him as Emperor and went on to attack Rome and virtually capture Gregory. In the long run it could be argued that the Investiture Contest was won by the papacy in that rulers no longer had a free hand regarding the church and the supremacy of the Pope over the church was recognised. But though Gregory set the movement in motion, his own achievement was limited.

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 2013	9769	21

15 Is the capture of Jerusalem in 1099 best explained by the abilities of the leaders of the First Crusade?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the role played by leaders such as Godfrey of Bouillon, Bohemond, Raymond of Toulouse and Baldwin and to other factors, such as the disunity among the Muslims, the religious devotion and fervour which inspired the movement and the assistance from the Byzantine Emperor in the early stages of the Crusade.

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 leaders played a considerable part in the capture of Jerusalem and the preceding campaign. The Crusaders would not have arrived at Jerusalem without the contributions of leaders like Godfrey at Dorylaeum and Bohemond at the siege of Antioch. Baldwin secured Edessa which provided supplies for the Crusaders. But alternatively, the lack of concerted resistance from the Muslims was a vital factor. Several Muslim leaders had died in the 1090s and their successors were fighting for power. Individual Muslim leaders such as Arslan were defeated, in his case at Nicaea and Kerbogha at Antioch. The Fatimids in Egypt offered little help to the Muslims. The religious motives of the Crusaders were important. The finding of the Holy Lance moved them forward at a crucial moment and the final attack on Jerusalem was undertaken with freeing the Holy Places in mind. In the initial stages, Alexius gave support and supplies to get the Crusaders on their way out of Constantinople, although he did not join them or send the troops he had promised. Thus candidates could conclude that, although the leadership was often strong and effective, had the Muslims put up stouter resistance, Jerusalem might well have stayed in their hands and the later history of the Crusades underlines this point.

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 2013	9769	21

Section 4: 1085–1250

16 How successful was Frederick Barbarossa in restoring royal authority in Germany?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates could refer to Frederick's aims in Germany and especially to his hopes of ending the prevalence of private warfare and his desire to regain 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 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 argue that Frederick enjoyed initial success with his decrees against private war, but that enforcement was another matter. With regard to the church he was soon able to insist on appointing his own bishops and the German clergy welcomed his exercise of his rights. With St Bernard dead and the Papacy facing problems he was unopposed at first. When the Pope did send legates to assert his position they were lucky not to be lynched. Frederick was also able to increase the amount of land he ruled either directly or through members of his family. Alternatively, Barbarossa's frequent interventions in Italy, often against the Pope, weakened his position in Germany and eventually led to a breach with his cousin, Henry the Lion, which caused Frederick to be defeated at Legnano when Henry refused to send him troops. When he did return to Germany and restore order forcibly, his attacks were indistinguishable from the civil wars he was trying to eradicate. Frederick's final settlement with Pope Alexander at Anagni led to the recognition of the German bishops but Frederick had to acknowledge Papal power.

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 2013	9769	21

17 How far was the strengthening of the French Monarchy by Louis VI and Louis VII the result of their military success?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might refer to the events of the reigns of Louis VI (1108–37) and Louis VII (1137–1180), their conquests and their policies.

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 might argue that the two monarchs had some military success. Louis VI besieged the castles of brigand barons and officials who refused to be dismissed. He repelled the invasion from Germany in 1124. Louis VII had less success in his wars with his vassals, notably the English king, and his role in the second Crusade lacked distinction. Alternatively the kings brought order to the royal demesne, and took control of administration. Both were well-served by Abbot Suger, who became a major contributor to the making of policy. Clerical staff were preferred to baronial. Louis VII worked to end the Papal schism and gave shelter to Becket whom he saw as the wronged party. But Louis VII never fully mastered the ambitious Henry II, who took his wife and some of his lands, but the Angevins were fully capable of bringing about their own destruction so Louis survived, by trying as far as possible to live in peace with them and giving refuge at court to whichever of Henry's sons had quarrelled with him. He eventually was provided with a male heir, a prince of greater ability, which allowed his reign to be perceived as more successful.

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 2013	9769	21

18 Assess the achievements of Philip Augustus.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates could refer to the role of Philip Augustus in increasing his kingdom as his soubriquet suggests, which led to the supremacy of the crown in France being fully 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 Philip's achievements were major. His regaining of Normandy and then most of the rest of the Angevin lands made a vast difference to the expanse of land he ruled and to his material resources, as well as enhancing his reputation. His first marriage allowed him to gain lands in the north. He took advantage of the quarrels of Henry II and his sons and emerged the victor. He was fortunate in that some of the rulers who might have rivalled him in Champagne and Flanders were under age and so regents were governing. In addition, he updated the administration in France and instigated efficient record keeping. He was a wealthy king with an increased revenue from his extended lands and his encouragement of trade. He had a professional mercenary army financed by levies on towns and monasteries. He kept an eye on fortifications whether in towns or castles. He used local administrators, *baillis*, to keep order and maintain contact with the central government. All in all it is hard to see where his achievement falls short.

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 2013	9769	21

19 Were Innocent III's aims primarily religious?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might refer to the situation when Innocent was elected and the main tasks that awaited him in the Empire, Italy and in Europe. They could suggest that Innocent would have seen all his aims as part of his religious duty.

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 in claiming Central Italy for the Papacy, Innocent was not pursuing a religious aim, nor was he in his actions in Sicily. Preserving the regno for the young Frederick was, similarly, largely a secular undertaking. The long struggle between Otto and Philip in Germany gave Innocent opportunities to play the statesman and move from studied neutrality to Otto to Philip and back to Otto when Philip died. He was able to secure recognition of his role in crowning the emperor and eradicate, in theory, and imperial control of the church. Otto's defiance of this agreement led to his downfall and replacement by Frederick to whose side the Pope rallied, at a price, and at the Lateran Council Frederick was confirmed as Emperor. But this was at odds with the papal policy of separating Sicily and Germany and led to much further involvement in politics. Alternatively, Innocent's intervention in England and France had more clearly religious motives. In England it was the issue of the next Archbishop of Canterbury and in France, Philip's relationships with women. In neither case was Innocent entirely successful. Philip outwitted him by taking his wife back just as Innocent took serious action and the excommunicated John only really reacted when England seemed likely to be invaded. Innocent also instigated the Fourth Crusade and began actions against the Albigensians and carried through a vigorous reform programme, exemplified by the decisions of the Lateran Council. He supervised bishops closely and levied direct taxes on the clergy and monasteries to finance the 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 24	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	21

20 How is the hostility of the Church to Frederick II best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates could refer to the situation when Frederick became Emperor and his actions which either evaded or ran counter to papal policy.

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 Frederick inherited a Germany where imperial control of the Church had been abandoned and civil war was rife. He had promised the Pope he would abdicate from Sicily in favour of his son and that he would embark on a Crusade, but planned to do neither. His empty promises led Honorius III to crown him as Emperor in return for aid to the Fifth Crusade. Frederick sent troops but stayed in Sicily himself with the intention of restoring the Norman monarchy there, including its power over the Church. Hence it is not surprising that the Church was hostile to him. Moreover, the next Pope, Gregory IX, excommunicated Frederick for his apathy over the Crusade and this led to further hostility and, indeed, outright war over a period of some years. Frederick's ambition to unite Italy and Germany was always stoutly resisted by the Papacy. Even when Frederick did join the Crusade the Pope did not relent. Successive Popes saw only too clearly that Papal power could not survive if Frederick's aims were achieved.

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 2013	9769	21

Section 5: Themes c. 300–c. 1200

21 'Feudal Society developed both quickly and extensively in Europe.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to any part of Europe where feudalism took hold and consider both the speed and spread of its development.

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 disorder of the Merovingian period led to a kind of feudalism being adopted, whereby lesser men swore loyalty to more powerful landowners who promised to protect them. Thus the origins of feudalism lay in the benefits of mutual obligations. In Western Europe landed officials of church and state took on the administration and when the disorder of the invasions and raids of the ninth century occurred, feudalism was the best way to preserve security. Thus its roots were established over a long period, but the triggers were short-term and as feudalism proved so effective a weapon, it spread rapidly. The details of the service due varied somewhat according to local custom, but in the lands once ruled by Charlemagne feudal society predominated. It became dangerous to be outside the system as it gave legality to land holding. In Northern France, Germany and Denmark as well as in England, feudalism became the norm within a century. Alternatively, there were large parts of Europe where other forms of society flourished and feudalism was not suitable. Terrain where the land was less productive did not have a feudal system and areas like Italy which were more urban also had other forms of society.

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 2013	9769	21

22 How significantly did patterns of trade change in Europe in the tenth and eleventh centuries?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates could refer to the pressures which led to the decline of trade by the tenth century and to the factors that allowed a gradual revival.

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 tenth century was not a period of widespread trading activity. The Latin west could not afford to pay for the luxury goods it had once imported from Byzantium and the threats to the Eastern Empire meant production fell. In addition trade routes were exposed to attacks from Muslims and from Vikings. The latter used rivers as a route for their raids and this affected trade badly as water transport was so much easier than using any kind of road. Alternatively, in the eleventh century trade began to revive in the west, with the growth of towns as centres for the sale of local produce and the opening of more secure trade routes. At the end of the period the crusading movement proved a great stimulus to trade. The new centres of activity tended to be in the Baltic and North Sea as the wool trade expanded and in the Mediterranean, where Italian cities like Venice were gradually taking over the spice trade from the Byzantine Empire. But these trends were only just beginning in the period up to 1100.

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 2013	9769	21

23 Assess the impact of the friars up to 1300.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates could refer to the foundation of the main orders of friars, the Franciscans and the Dominicans, and the progress they made in this period.

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 impact of the friars was considerable. Their influence was most marked in two areas. First, they had a great impact on intellectual life. St Francis had resisted this trend but Franciscans such as Robert Grosseteste at Oxford was a leading thinker. Divinity faculties resisted the advent of the friars at first, but, by 1300, both Paris and Oxford had accepted them on papal orders. From the Dominicans came St Thomas Aquinas and work such as revisions of texts, while the original thinkers came from the Franciscans with Roger Bacon as well as Grosseteste. Secondly they revolutionised popular preaching with Berchtold of Regensburg as a leading exponent. The vigour of their preaching led to fraternities for penitents being set up as a Tertiary order. They also went east as missionaries and were active in the Inquisition and assaults on heresy. Thus they had a vital role in the church of the thirteenth century. Like most religious orders, the friars suffered from a dilution of the rigour of their rule as the century proceeded, and from the hostility of the monastic orders, but they remained extremely popular and the attraction of St Francis was perennial.

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 2013	9769	21

24 Should both the Second and Third Crusades be regarded as ‘abject failures’?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the aims and events of each of the Crusades and to the outcomes to judge how far they succeeded.

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 Second Crusade was indeed an ‘abject failure’. It was provoked by the loss of Edessa in 1144 to the Muslims and was vigorously preached by St Bernard who urged that it was meritorious to kill a pagan. But the thousands of eager crusaders caused tension with the settlers of the Crusader States, who co-existed with their Muslim neighbours out of expediency. Hence the Crusaders marched on Damascus, a city held by an ally of the settled Europeans and failed to take it, blaming the lack of aid from resident crusaders. These events led on to encourage Nur-ad-Din, who united the previously disparate and rival Muslim territories, and his nephew Saladin, who became ruler of Egypt and Syria. In 1187 he won the Battle of Hattin and recaptured Jerusalem, thus causing the Third Crusade to be preached. Alternatively, some success can be claimed for the Third Crusade. Richard I captured Acre and secured a naval base at Cyprus. He took Jaffa and came within sight of Jerusalem. He made an agreement with Saladin to allow access for pilgrims. But the quarrels between Richard and Philip Augustus discredited the crusade and Philip’s early return and attacks on Richard’s lands, not to mention Richard’s capture and subsequent ransom, devalued the crusading ideal, under which a crusader and his lands were meant to be protected by the church throughout his whole journey. So this Crusade, too, can be assessed as a failure but perhaps not quite as an ‘abject’ one.

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 2013	9769	21

25 How distinctive was the political thought of the tenth and eleventh centuries?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates could refer to Augustine's *De Civitate Dei* as the basis of medieval political thought and to later developments arising from the decline of the Empire and the rise of the universal 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 may argue that political thought was heavily influenced by the precedents of classical writers and the governance of the Roman Empire. Pope Gelasius had urged that there were two spheres of power on earth, priests and kings, and that the supreme pontiff had overall responsibility to God. This was in contrast to the eastern Empire where a kind of Caesaro-papism was the norm. There were also precedents from the Carolingians, who had adopted the Old Testament view of the king as priest. The papacy, helped by the so-called Donation of Constantine, worked to overthrow this view. Alternatively, there were developments, arising from the moral decline of the Papacy and the attempts by Emperors to rule justly, so that the view of rulers as Heads of the Church prevailed for a time, until the papal revival argued that the Pope was overall and the lay power drew authority from God in subordination to the spiritual power. In the early twelfth century St Bernard exemplified this view with his allegory of the two swords, both entrusted to the Pope, who then handed the lay sword to secular rulers.

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 2013	9769	21

26 How important was the Inquisition in the eradication of the Cathars?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might refer to the beliefs of the Cathars and their establishment of a rival Church. The support of Raymond of Toulouse made them more dangerous. Papal methods of eradication included the use of friars, excommunication, warfare and the Inquisition, at first in the form of Papal delegates whose power overrode that of bishops.

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 Inquisition came in where other methods of persuasion had failed and in the hope that war could be avoided. The papal legates were widely resented and their assumption that secular rulers would help them proved unfounded. Philip Augustus, as the overlord of Languedoc, was more concerned with his war against England. The murder of the hated Castlenau in 1208 showed how strong the feeling was against the Inquisition. When the Inquisition was formally set up in 1233 it was eagerly embraced by St Louis and by the Counts of Toulouse, so that the Cathars were largely wiped out in Languedoc. Alternatively other methods were attempted. Cistercian monks were sent to reason with the Cathars but got nowhere. The wealth of their Order was contrasted unfavourably with the simple life style of the Cathars. Even St Dominic could not talk them round. Civil Law had allowed the introduction of the death penalty for heresy and from 1184 it had been agreed that bishops should search for heretics and then hand them over to the secular arm for punishment, which could be exile, confiscation of property or death. Thus there was a deterrent effect. In the end it was the mobilisation of a fanatical armed force under Simon de Montfort which led to the capture of Beziers and Carcassonne in 1209 in the Albigensian Crusade. But even this was not a permanent victory as the French later intervened and it was not until 1229 that the Languedoc was finally subdued and incorporated into France.

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 2013	9769	21

Section 6: 1250–c. 1378

27 Why did the war of the Sicilian Vespers go on for so long?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might refer to the situation which led to the war and the various factions which were involved in it.

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 war resulted from the hostility within Sicily to the rule of the Angevins and that national feeling was determined to assert Sicilian independence. In addition, Sicily as an island could hold out against attacks and the fleet was supported by the Catalan navy. Charles of Anjou died in the early stages of the war and his heir, Charles II, was captured by the fleet and so regents had to be appointed. Charles was not released until 1288. The papacy was too weak to enforce its policy and was fully occupied in Northern and Central Italy. Even when James II of Aragon agreed to renounce Sicily in 1295 and marry Charles II's daughter, the Sicilians refused to agree and made James' brother, Frederick, their king. The efforts of James, the Angevins and later Charles of Valois were unavailing and peace was finally made in 1302 and reluctantly accepted by Pope Boniface the next year. Two equally stubborn and determined forces in the shape of the Sicilian people and a succession of Popes are probably the main reason why the wars went on for twenty years.

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 2013	9769	21

28 How far was religion the motivating force of Louis IX?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might refer to the events of the reign of Louis, who ruled in person from 1254 to 1270. His upright rule in France and his policies towards the Crusades and heretics 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 religious principles instilled by his mother, Blanche, governed Louis' life and reign. Unusually for the time, he lived up to the ideals of knighthood and saw it as his duty as an anointed king to rule justly, bring peace to his realm and to defend the Church and true religion. Thus he was ruthless in suppressing heresy and supported the Inquisition. He went on Crusade twice with little concrete result apart from heavy expenditure. He built abbeys and took care over church appointments. He admonished bishops who did not meet his standards. He prohibited private war in his pursuit of peace. Some of his other policies were motivated by more secular intentions. He kept out of the conflict between the Papacy and Frederick II and was not so devout that he would recognise the right of the Pope to depose a monarch. His even-handedness led to him being accepted as arbiter in disputes about the succession in places like Flanders. His Mise of Amiens was less successful in England. His administration maintained the rights of the crown in the same way as previous rulers, although he tried to ensure officials were not too heavy handed and he tried many cases himself. His zeal for good government could have had dual motives from both religion and the need to keep the people content and avoid oppressive measures. Candidates might conclude that, for Louis, religion was dominant, but that more worldly aims were to be discerned in his policies as well.

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 2013	9769	21

29 How responsible was Philip the Fair for the quarrel with the Papacy?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might refer to the events preceding the reign of Philip the Fair which left him in need of funds and to the reform programme of Boniface VIII, leading to the conflict between them.

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 general the interests of the French king and the Pope coincided so the quarrel was an unusual exception. Boniface contributed in that when elected he was determined to pull back the powers which his predecessors had ceded to the French monarchy, which he believed weakened his position and he also wanted some of the wealth of the French church to help in his aims for Italy and Sicily. Hence he issued a Bull forbidding taxation of the Church without papal consent on pain of automatic excommunication. He then gave way and allowed a clerical tenth to be collected, although he had first declared it to be unacceptable. Thus his inconsistency meant that when he was alarmed by other French actions and issued a further Bull claiming papal supremacy was essential for the salvation of all, Philip felt justified in acting against him. The Pope had alienated many Italian families, notably the Colonna and they were ready to support Philip and Nogaret in their attacks on the Pope. Philip's role lay in his insistence that he needed church revenues after the extravagant wars of his father, in order to fight his own wars, mainly against the English. Hence he resisted the claims of Boniface and forbade the export of money from France to frustrate him. In 1301 Philip arrested and tried a French bishop and defied the papal orders in response to this provocation. But the main French responsibility was in the plot to seize Boniface at Agnagni in 1303, which led to his death later in the year. As better relations were resumed under the next Pope, candidates could reasonably suggest that Boniface had provoked the quarrel.

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 2013	9769	21

**30 ‘The residence of the Popes in Avignon strengthened, rather than weakened, the Papacy.’
Discuss.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might refer to the circumstances in which the Papacy left Rome and to the policies pursued by the Avignon Popes.

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 safer in Avignon than in Rome and relatively independent as it was near but outside France. Popes felt Rome could only be their home if the influence of the German Emperor was removed from Italy and this became their aim. They also wished to bring an end to the Hundred Years War in order to launch further crusades against the advancing Turks whom they saw as the greatest threat to Christendom and being close at hand to the scene of action would make their peacemaking role easier to achieve. While in Avignon the centralising of the Church and the development of the Roman Curia reached its peak and the power of the Papacy was far from being abated. Clement V abolished the Order of the Temple. Gregory IX asserted his right to nominate to all vacant sees. An elaborate system of fees payable to the Curia for many kinds of favours provided the funds needed to sustain the bureaucracy. The Avignon Popes were vigorous persecutors of heresy. Alternatively, the Papacy was widely viewed, especially in Italy, as the creature of the French king and referred to as the ‘Babylonish Captivity’. Most of the Cardinals appointed by the French Popes were French, leading to factionalism. Papal authority in central Italy collapsed, along with income, and many of the Popes were tremendous nepotists, weakening the church in this way. The College of Cardinals took the opportunity to extend its own powers and bid for independence, even trying to bind future Popes only to pass decrees which at least two-thirds of the Cardinals supported. Candidates could conclude that the Papacy did not seem to be seriously weakened when it returned to Rome and even the Great Schism did not damage it permanently.

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 2013	9769	21

31 Assess the view that the Italian city states experienced a state of economic crisis for much of the fourteenth century.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the rivalries between the states and the instability of their governments, leading to economic crisis.

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 political conditions in the city states meant the economy could not flourish. The cities of northern Italy were marked by class conflict and internal strife. The decline of the citizen militias had allowed the Free Companies of mercenaries to flourish and their depredations were harmful to commerce. Venice and Genoa were locked in conflict. Florence was weakened by its efforts to obtain Lucca and by the bankruptcies of the Bardi and the Peruzzi who had lent unwisely to European kings. Siena and Pisa declined as well. The Black Death was another destructive factor. Alternatively, some of the states recovered and their economies improved. Venice was held together by the stable government of the oligarchy and regained much of its trade. In the 1380s the Florentine government came back into the hands of oligarchs, who were skilled in the development of trade. Over the period Italian innovation brought the joint-stock company, the bill of exchange and the introduction of insurance into commercial practice. They also developed a system of credit, partly to evade church restrictions on lending money for interest. Thus candidates could conclude that despite the air of crisis, the Italian traders, merchants and bankers went on making money, notably in the latter part 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 36	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	21

Section 7: c. 1378–c. 1461

**32 ‘The causes of the Great Schism were trivial, yet the Schism had profound consequences.’
How far do you agree?**

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 of the Schism and its impact should not be highly rewarded. Possible causes might include: the crisis of values; the issue of church/state relations; the papacy becoming a satellite of France; the criticism of people like John of Paris; Marsiglio of Padua and William of Ockham; the building craze of the papacy as well as their bureaucratic mentality and materialism; the politics surrounding the election of Urban VI. The impact might include: the prestige of the papacy; the credibility of the Church; renewal movements such as Wyclif and Hus; secular authority v ecclesiastical authority; the possible ‘democratisation’ of the church; rise of national churches; ignoring the cry for reform.

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 and 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 interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Thinking about ‘trivial’ and ‘profound’ obviously deserves reward and candidates who challenge either or both clearly have a point. The focus should be on the ‘extent’ and stronger responses will include a real attempt to weigh up the nature and extent of both the causes and the consequences of the Schism.

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 2013	9769	21

33 Why did fifteenth-century Italian city states have such different models of government?

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. Purely descriptive accounts of the different types of government of the city states should not be highly rewarded, although a clear account of the different types has some merit. Factors which might be considered are: geographical and economic factors, plus the inevitable rivalries; the separatist traditions; ability of specific systems to deliver prosperity-e.g. Sforza of Milan; the administrative ability of the Venetians-plus specific socio/economic factors there-the even spread of wealth-good government protecting the interests of all classes-a well organised citizenship; the way rulers in Florence adapted to the character and ideals of the citizenship; devotion to republican ideals; the ability of the Medici to develop a good relationship with citizens and play the ‘servant of the people’ role; the relationship between the great Roman families-the papacy and the cardinals; the independent traditions of places like Perugia and Bologna; the specific reasons behind the oligarchy in Siena.

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 and 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 interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The focus should be on explanation and the ability to demonstrate awareness of the very different reasons which existed for the diverse systems of government of the differing states. Ideally there should be some broader generic reasons as well as awareness of specific reasons behind individual city states and there should be analysis of at least two or three of the city states in some depth.

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 2013	9769	21

34 'Deep-rooted failings within the Byzantine Empire, rather than Ottoman military competence, explain the fall of Constantinople.' 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 of the fall should not be rewarded, but inevitably they might contain some impolitic reasons. Possible failings within the Empire might include: territorial divisions and disputes within the empire; end of independent Bulgaria and Serbia; Greek isolation; hostility of Naples/Venice and Genoa for their own reasons; doctrinal divisions; failure of mercenary system; lack of common causes between East and West; Russia distracted by Tartars. Ottoman military factors might include: the superb feat of arms of the assaults; the quality of soldiers; the engineering feats; the quality and role of the ships used; the cannon; the leadership at all levels-the attacking skills and ruthless discipline.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focussed and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and 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 interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. A real weighing up is looked for, with the two sides of the argument being balanced against each other and a well reasoned conclusion being reached. There is obviously no 'right' answer, both sides have their advocates. The best responses will start with a precise analytical focus which is heading for one side or the other, while at the same time demonstrating awareness of what critics of their point of view might argue.

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 2013	9769	21

35 How convincing is the claim that theological disputes were at the heart of the Hussite 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. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative/descriptive accounts of the movement and the work of Hus should not get far. There are many other ‘wider’ factors which might be considered as well as theological ones such as: the wider implications of the Avignon split; the prestige of the papacy; Wyclif had already raised issues such as – councils, depriving corrupt clergy of their jobs, secular authority’s ability to reform the church, biblical based Christianity; Hus’ ability as a preacher/inspirational figure; the immorality of the papacy and the higher clergy; ‘communism’ issues; nationalism; wider criticism of the church; he was primarily a reformer on institutions not an advocate of theological change.

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 and 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 interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. An analysis of the nature of the Hussite movement and its supporters as well as the ideas, motives and career of Hus himself is looked for. There should be effective consideration of the ‘extent’ factor’ and a serious weighing up of how much it was primarily about theological matters, and what part was played by a variety of other factors such as those listed above.

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 2013	9769	21

36 ‘No one really won or lost the Hundred Years War.’ 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 of the War should not score highly, but the ability to demonstrate awareness that it was an intermittent struggle with only sporadic fighting and the possible misleading nature of the names should get some credit. Factors which might be raised could be: the territorial and feudal claims of the English throne; the stimulation of nationalistic feelings by Joan of Arc and Crecy and Agincourt; the French monarchy gaining territory; the French monarchy checking feudal fragmentation-barriers between the centre and Picardy/Gascony/Normandy; English territorial losses; English retention of Calais which opened up the whole wool trade of Flanders; English no longer had serious drain of wealth and implication for authority of the monarchy; war actually strengthens both monarchies and countries.

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 and 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 interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Some careful thinking about ‘winning’ and ‘losing’ is called for and candidates who genuinely try to reflect on these two terms should be rewarded. The range of possible answers is vast and those who adopt a properly analytical approach which look at the ‘war’ in both the short and long term and rises above a straightforward list of battles should do well.

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 2013	9769	21

Section 8: 1461–c. 1516

37 Assess the significance of the death of Charles the Bold (1477) for both France and Burgundy.

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 of the reign and descriptions of later events will not do well. Factors which might be considered: the long and costly wars were largely his ideas; women were left in charge—with some complications; Estates took advantage –right to self assembly-declarations of war etc; Mary was to grant the ‘Grand Privilege’-restricting rulers; major reaction encouraged Netherlands particularism; territorial self sufficiency was to grow; France overran parts-also the deserters to France; Mary’s Habsburg marriage; the Burgundian alliance with England and its implications; reaction against centralisation-precursor to a long constitutional crisis; Peace of Arras-great significance to France-especially as far as Flanders was concerned.

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 and 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 interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Expect some thinking on the issue of ‘turning’ point, and what might or might not constitute one. It could be argued that it was less of one for Burgundy than it was for France, but there are a variety of views which could be successfully considered. The ‘significance’ aspect always should be central to a good answer, with serious consideration of the degree of significance.

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 2013	9769	21

38 ‘The primary concern of the Popes in this period was the advancement of their own families.’ 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 of papal history of the period are not required. There is lots of scope here, and while some generalisation is appropriate, some detail on individual popes is expected. Popes/factors which might be considered are: Nicholas V – the scholar of the Vatican Library-but too involved in temporal glory and art. Ignored the Turkish threat; Calixtus III – the nepotist and crusader; Pius II – the humanist-crusader and re affirmation of papal absolutism; the ‘evil genius’ – Sixtus IV, Innocent VIII and Alexander VI with their: nepotism, extortionism, territorial ambitions, inquisition in Spain and witchcraft obsessions, foolish attitude to the Turns, simony of Rodrigo di Borgia in 1492; Alexander VI – the able but totally unscrupulous one-support for his family, treatment of Savonarola, division of the new World, political dabbling in the Italian wars, ignoring growth of Gallican tendencies and demands for reform; Julius II, the nephew of Alex; the soldier Pope-the war with Venice; attacked by Erasmus; utilisation of Lateran Council for his own ends; culminating in the election of the Medici Leo X in 1513.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focussed and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and 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 interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. This question offers lots of scope. Simple description of anti-clericalism will not score highly. The ‘primary concern’ aspect needs to be looked at closely. Analysis of papal policy should be there as well, with at least an attempt to argue that at times there were possibly ‘higher’ motives. Valid attempts at the counter argument should be rewarded.

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 2013	9769	21

39 Assess the strengths and weakness of Ottoman Empire 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 as strengths are: the weakness and division of the opponents of the Ottomans; Ottoman military strength and organisation, both on land and at sea; the quality of leadership at all levels, not just the rulers themselves, but also Viziers etc.; the sensible colonial policy; their rule and issues like communications; sensible taxation and tolerance of other religions. Factors which might be considered as weaknesses are: their over ambition; the tendency to get seriously overstretched in terms of resources; dependence on one quality leader; finite resources; dependence on the weaknesses of others; dependence on subject peoples.

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 and 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 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. Ideally a balanced argument as opposed to just a list of strengths and weaknesses will be provided, both prioritising each, as well as coming to a conclusion as to whether one outweighed the other.

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 2013	9769	21

40 To what extent was war more important than marriage in explaining Habsburg expansion in the reign of Maximilian I?

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 of the reign are not required. Factors which might be considered are: Italian diplomacy; the Sforza marriage; the Spanish marriages-especially. the Prince to Juana; war with France failed badly in Italy; failed in the Swiss conflict; some success in the Bavarian war; Holy League failed; yet successes in Austria.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focussed and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and 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 interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. An analysis of the primary reasons for Habsburg expansion is called for. While there is a good case to be made for the marriages, balance is needed and there are obvious ‘other factors’ which need to be weighed up. Stronger responses will give a fairly precise picture of the ‘extent’ and produce valid reasons for their answer.

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 45	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	21

**41 ‘The conquest of Granada was the greatest achievement of Ferdinand and Isabella.’
Discuss.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a 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 of the reign will not do well unless there is a constant focus on achievement. There are a good range of factors which can be considered, in addition to the conquest itself: the end of the Moslem conflict and the sensible treatment of the Moslems; the discovery of America; Castile becoming a world power; development of Castile as a centre of world trade; making unification a reality-creation of a Spanish state; new institutions of government; Renaissance state; power of the crown and reduction of nobles’ powers, dealing with military orders; royal administration, revival of the Hermandad; church state relations, Inquisition, Jews; excellent foreign policy.

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 and 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 interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Weighing up the implication of the conquest against the many other factors is looked for. Candidates should give evidence that they have really thought about ‘achievement’ and also thought about the short and long term impact of much of the work of the two.

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 2013	9769	21

Section 9: Themes c. 1200–c. 1516

42 How convincing is the view that the cult of chivalry in the thirteenth century was more theoretical than practical?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might refer to chivalry as the code of men who fought on horseback, which was seen as superior to the systems governing the lives of lower classes. Military prowess, loyalty to one's overlord and courteous manners to one's equals were emphasised.

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 preoccupation with romantic literature, the deeds of King Arthur and his knights or Charlemagne and his paladins such as Roland were more theoretical, since the nature of warfare had changed so much in the intervening years. The deeds of the heroes of Greek mythology might be a suitable topic for interior decoration but not a real life model. The biographies of chivalric knights of the time, like William Marshal, often depicted impossibly saintly figures. Some kings even suggested that wars could be settled by combat between individual knights. Alternatively, real warfare had no time for such conventions. Tournaments might teach knights the skills needed in combat, but the reality was bloodier. The English armies began to rely on the longbow, rather than cavalry and even had a hero, Robin Hood, to match the knightly ideal. The French also discovered that cavalry could be brought up short by massed infantry at Courtrai. Candidates are likely to conclude that the chivalric code was never going to be useful in the exigencies of medieval warfare, but that, as an ideal, it served a purpose, and occupied knights in their rest periods.

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 2013	9769	21

43 What was new about Gothic art?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might refer to the visual arts in painting, sculpture and architecture and developments especially in France and Germany.

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 Gothic art evolved from a preoccupation with buildings and stemmed from northern France. It also reflected the increasing skills of the artists and craftsmen. Some of the innovation was technical, such as the ribbed vault, the pointed arch and the flying buttress. Massive, gloomy buildings gave way to delicate and light-filled constructions. Ornamental sculpture developed from the stiff leaf to the more natural flowing forms. Even the representation of recumbent forms on tombstones moved from the standard model to some attempt at individual depiction and a natural stance. Colour was another novelty with the work of the painter complimenting that of the architect. Wall-paintings and stained glass illustrated this especially. Illuminated manuscripts exemplified an international Gothic style, leading to the depiction of more accurate detail. Candidates could mention that Gothic was a development from Romanesque and did not replace it everywhere and that some of its characteristics were influenced by Byzantine models. Some of the architectural developments were based on classical precedents. But, in general, Gothic was a new flowering of artistic endeavour.

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 2013	9769	21

44 Was the Papacy threatened more by heresy or by the conciliar movement in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might refer to the heretical movements of the period such as the Hussites and to the meetings of the Councils of Pisa, Constance and Basle.

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 Hussites were a serious threat as they combined religious and nationalist aspirations. They were a challenge to the universality of the Church and their radical doctrines attacked central tenets and also targeted the corruption of the Church. Their success impacted on the Papacy in that it needed help to suppress them and thus had to make concessions to that end. But the Hussites were restricted largely to Bohemia and the Czechs and the execution of Hus limited their impact. They were also divided amongst themselves, with rival groups in Prague and Tabor. Communion in both kinds was their main unifying belief. The conciliar movement had the possibility of being a real threat to the Papacy. The Council of Pisa in 1409 managed to end the Schism, by the dubious expedient of appointing a third Pope, but this showed its capabilities. The Council of Constance helped the Papacy by burning Hus, but its desire to attack abuses was a threat to the Popes. It also opened up the whole issue of sovereignty in the church and where it lay and conciliar advocates claimed that a General Council outweighed the Papacy. This was a clear threat. In the end the Council was able to end the Schism, but national interests defeated the reform movement and the Papacy was safe. The Council of Basle hoped to initiate a reform programme and curb Papal powers, but became sidelined in the negotiations with the Greek Church about reunion. Division and discord followed and the conciliar movement was defeated even though Councils at Ferrara and Florence were held and Basle lingered on. The conciliar movement had the greater potential as a threat and its inability to bring about reform was instrumental in the evolution of 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 2013	9769	21

45 Assess the impact of demographic change in Europe after the Black Death.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the immediate impact of the plague on populations and to the longer term effects, both economic 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 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 are likely to suggest that the immediate impact of the plague in the death of up to a quarter of the population was considerable. In Scandinavia, France, Germany and Italy the result was depopulation, not only in rural areas where whole villages were lost, but also in many towns where the closeness of houses made it easy for infection to spread rapidly. This, in turn, led on to a lack of labour on manorial farms and a fall in the value of land. Wool production fell in England which had a bad effect on the Flemish cloth trade. It could be argued that these changes were not universally deleterious. Former labourers could acquire farms. Enterprising merchants could make good profits. The differences could be seen in Italy where Lucca gave way to Florence or in Flanders where Antwerp replaced Bruges, for reasons which were partly demographic, but not entirely. The extent to which demographic change caused the popular unrest of the period in Flanders and Italy has been debated. 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 2013	9769	21

46 How great was the contribution of both clerical and lay patrons to the development of the visual arts in the Italian Renaissance?

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. Purely descriptive accounts of the Renaissance will not get far and coverage should not be restricted to just a single form such as painting or sculpture. Factors which might be considered are: patrons who decided both theme and content; the urban ruling classes dominating so many aspects of ‘art’; the role of governments and institutions like the papacy; patron influence in areas such as painting/sculpture and architecture; analysis of the impact of patronage on individuals such as Leonardo, Michelangelo, Raphael; looking at wider issues where patronage is less influential such as – science, warfare, literature, mathematics, medicine, astronomy, printing, the role of universities and individuals.

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 and 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 interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Separation of lay and ecclesiastical is called for and serious analysis of the overall impact of patronage on the causes and course of the Renaissance and its ‘products’. Those who reflect carefully on the idea of ‘no patronage-no Renaissance’ and come up with some form of balanced answer or even speculate on what form it might have otherwise taken, should be rewarded.

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 2013	9769	21

47 Why was the family so important to later-medieval society?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a 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. Descriptive accounts of the role of family in the period will not get far. Factors which might be considered are: the crucial role it played in the upper classes; the importance of family/primogeniture for inheritance purposes; the vital role of the household; the shift from the multiple to the emergent nuclear family in the sixteenth century; its role in child rearing/education and as an economic and social unit; could vary considerably depending on prevailing social and above all economic conditions; family intermarriage vital of economic and social status; Louis of France ‘marriage was the cement of the state’; huge stress placed by so many on marriage; revival of Roman law changed it; impact of Puritanism on it.

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 and 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 interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Some clear ideas on the role of the family in society are looked for. To what extent was the family central to the lives of people? Did it vary according to class and wealth?

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.