

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2010 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

9769 HISTORY

9769/21

Paper 21 (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 must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- CIE will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2010 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

Section 1: c. 300–c. 632

1 How significant an impact did Constantine the Great have on the development of the Roman Empire?

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. A narrative of Constantine's career will not score much, unless there is good explanation. Analysis and evaluation are needed here. Consideration is likely to be given to such factors and features as his success in gaining sole power, his adoption of the cross and subsequent legalisation of Christianity, his support for the Church and major involvement in doctrinal matters (above all at Nicaea), his legal reforms, his military reforms, his style of monarchy, the foundation of Constantinople. Of course, negatives need to be considered as well: possible examples are the destruction of the tetrarchal system, the arrangements for the succession, the failure to really resolve the problems caused by the barbarians, areas of economic pressure and problems. His standing and the idea of 'greatness' need to be considered, not least in the context of the reign and of the changing nature, problems of and threats to the Empire.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The formulation of the question ('How significant') invites argument and counter-argument, with scope for debate. Here, consideration can be given to Constantine's military and political capacity and impact set alongside the adoption and promotion of Christianity, and what flowed from that. A good focus on development – operating at several levels and in several areas – will be required. Personal impact can be addressed alongside institutional, structural and of course, religious-social.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

2 Assess the importance of economic factors in the collapse of Roman power in the West in the fifth century.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire is not useful here. There needs to be analysis and evaluation. Answers need to assess a range of economic factors against other factors. Some brief contrasts to the Empire in the East would be acceptable, either to show common issues and yet the latter's survival or else to show particular Western issues. Economic factors can include: the extent of population shifts, pressures, problems over food supplies; the fall in economic productivity; the decline in the profits from wars; a drift from towns and urban stagnation; taxation levels; attendant social changes, including attitudinal amongst the elites' broad economic decline. Structural problems – governmental, economic, fiscal, perhaps social – could be adduced. Then there are factors such as the emperor's personal qualities, fluctuations in religious policy, the appointment of barbarian generals and a failure to control them, a diminishing control over the army and the civil service, divisions within the Empire, tensions of East and West, military and political weaknesses, the failure to defend the frontiers, the admission and settlement of barbarian tribes.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question ('Assess') sets up argument and counter-argument, with some sense of the relative importance of factors, albeit with an awareness of links. There has been and there remains much debate: for example, over socio-economic factors, over internal as against external factors, over manpower shortages, over religious factors. A massive range of factors has been adduced, ranging from moral decline and turpitude to the nature of the water supply in major towns and cities. At core, political, military and economic issues were paramount, however, and these are likely to be prominent here. Recent works have also argued for very slow changes and for a return to political-military predominance, linked to further reappraisals of both the late Roman economy and of the position and role of the barbarian groups. There will need to be sense of cross-evaluation of factors, setting economic against several others.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

3 How effective was Pope Gregory the Great's leadership of the Church?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Analysis and evaluation are required; a narrative of Gregory's life and career cannot score much, unless there is strong explanation. There is some scope for assessment here, with a sense of the short- and long-term as to his impact, stature and importance. Reference can be made to such areas as his strong and efficient administration of the patrimonial lands, his social and charity work, his extensive writings, interest in reform, the mission to England, dealings with rulers, staving off the Lombard threat, general elevation of the Holy See, arguable 'monasticisation' of the Papacy. Then again, he rejected the prior 'authoritarian' ways of his predecessors, yielded willingly to the Emperor, was not very popular, used up much of the papal treasury, did not attempt to convert the Lombards or pursue with any vigour the needs of reform in the Frankish Church. Indeed, his stature was decidedly posthumous. Long- and short-term perspectives will matter here (so, for example, the mission to England, the status of his writings, his patrimonial reorganisation and the changes to the papacy's character may be viewed as important long-term issues).

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question ('How effective') invites argument and counter-argument, with scope for debate, not least as to Gregory's standing and status. As in AO1 above, retrospective considerations may be engaged strongly, pointing up the lack of real contemporary impact. The apparent subservience to secular rulers may be seen as unusual given that the future 'great' Popes were determined to assert papal supremacy. Then again, the acquisition of the epithet 'Great' may be debated here; again, perspectives matter. There needs to be a good focus on long as against short term perspectives and on the idea and concept (execution, delivery) of leadership.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

4 How strong was EITHER the Ostrogothic kingdom in Italy OR the seventh-century Visigothic kingdom?

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. A narrative or description will not go far here, unless there is strong explanation, linked to the needs of the question. Analysis and evaluation are needed, linked to the longevity, strengths and weaknesses, stability or instability of either kingdom – with suitable illustrative material adduced.

Ostrogothic Kingdom: Theoderic ('the Great') presided over an apparently stable Italy; invaders were stopped; Arians and Catholics were in harmony; there was no internal unrest; economic activity was decent enough. Then again, it can be argued that religious hostility was not far away; Roman 'treason' was a threat to Theoderic late on in his reign; the emperors and Catholic Franks were hostile to each other; after Theoderic's death, Justinian was able to invade a kingdom that was dissolving fast. Candidates will need to assess other rulers as well, even if Theoderic is viewed as key.

Visigothic Kingdom: in the seventh century there was great emphasis on unity: territorial, legal, credal, and apparent stability. But, again, such stability and unity were superficial: there were deep internal divisions, political and social; there was a lack of dynastic continuity; the Jewish problem; regional rivalries and Roman-Gothic tensions and divisions. And, of course, the Kingdom fell quickly to Arab invaders in 711.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question formulation invites argument and some counter-argument; there is scope for debate as to the nature, strengths and inner weaknesses of these kingdoms; the Roman survivals and uses made of Roman practices and institutions; the role of religion; the precarious nature of rulership, the over-dependence on strong rulers.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

5 'Justinian the Great's policy of reconquering the West seriously weakened his Empire.' Discuss this view.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of the reign will need good explanation areas to score mildly well; rather good analysis and evaluation are needed here. There is plenty here for assessment: his leadership; the nature of his rule; the determination to recover lands in the West and reunite the Empire; his strategy, tactics and appointment of generals; defence and security of frontiers; resources; costs; the state of the economy; heresy and religion; internal unrest (riots); law codifications; building projects. There was much that appeared glorious and successful and caught the contemporary eye. But consideration could be given, especially in the best answers, to arguments such as: the expenditure of blood, effort and money in the West was not worthwhile and could have been better expended elsewhere; the ending of Ostrogothic power opened up Italy to Lombard invasions; the East was left vulnerable; Slav, Persian (some add in Muslim) attacks were facilitated; the Empire was literally left impoverished. A good focus on 'weakened' will be required, so opening up the perspectives and arguments.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question invites evaluation, short- and long-term, as to the extent, nature and impact of success set against failure. Justinian has been regarded as 'great' and there has been much argument about his real stature. For example, his Western operations have been seen as outmoded, unnecessary; then again, it is possible to argue that he did not commit enough resources in the West; his reputation depends excessively on his law codes and building operations. Here, good focus will need to be on operations in the Western lands set against those in the eastern and northern frontiers. Eastern economic and financial resources, their state and strengths and weaknesses, will be a feature of evaluation; so, too the strategic concerns and sense of strategic-imperial imperatives. The whole area of Justinian's views of 'empire' and his determination to recover, rebuild, regenerate, renew (all important words, ideas) the old Roman empire in the West will form a major theme and will be set alongside his position in the East and his attitude to its governance, defence and security.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

Section 2: c. 632–c. 919

6 'Arab success in the seventh century depended on the weaknesses of their opponents.' 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. A narrative is not required; rather analysis and evaluation are needed. Answers will need to set the weaknesses of opponents against a range of other factors. A range of opponents can be considered, with the Byzantines to the fore. Flawed strategies and tactics, weak leadership, a lack of zeal, possible welcoming of the Arabs by dissident groups within the Byzantine lands, could all be assessed.

Set against the above will be Arab strengths and economic, military and political factors. Religion is bound to feature: zeal, fatalism (Koran and salvation), the means to unite different tribal groups, the impetus to conquest. The nature of the peninsula, economic pressures to find lands and resources, the nature of Arab leadership can be assessed also. Expansion may have been opportunistic or the search for material betterment. Military and naval power and superiority, divided imperial counsels, the weakening of the Byzantine Empire by the major Avar and Persian wars, failure to take the Arabs seriously enough, all are further factors here.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question invites argument and counter-argument, a sense of the relative importance of factors, albeit with an awareness of connections. Of course, here, religious factors are likely to be seen as crucial; so, too, there is argument over inner Byzantine divisions and weaknesses, with some arguing that there were those who welcomed the Arabs as liberators.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

7 Who contributed more to the Carolingian ascendancy: Charles Martel or Pepin III?

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. A narrative of events will not succeed; rather good analysis and evaluation are required here. Answers will need to balance the accruing Carolingian strengths as Mayors of the Palace and prominence as feudal lords with patronage to dispose and clear military strengths against the growing weaknesses of the Merovingian kings. Context will be important; so too, personalities and power politics. Comparative analysis and evaluation will work well here; sequential less so.

Likely factors to be assessed are: the concentration of power in the hands of the Mayors; the extension of their authority to all Merovingian kingdoms (Arnulf and Pepin I in Austrasia, Pepin II and Tertry, Charles Martel and Pepin III); the lines of dependence linking the Carolingians and the military elites; their military successes, above all those of Charles Martel; the links with the Church and Papacy, the replacement of the mythical standing of the Merovingians with the religious sanction of the Church; the anarchy of areas of Merovingian Gaul; successive generations dividing the royal inheritance; jealousies and wars; the lack of kings of stature; the transfer of political authority to the Mayors. Of course, many of these themes are linked. Operations at the core (Neustria, Burgundy, Austrasia) and then the periphery (dealing with the Bavarians, alemans and Aquitanians) and then extended to the area of the Pyrenees, Saxony and Italy can be invoked. The importance of the civil war of 714–19 and the need to reconquer and reconstruct territorial entities as well as the responses to the internal crises of 747–53 may well feature strongly the latter will link to the need for a strong, legitimate king. The defeat of opposition, the reshaping of the Frankish elite as a militarised aristocracy, the rewards (booty, plunder, patronage), the uses of forms of political violence, regular wars, the expansionism of territorial interests can all be linked here. As to specifics, for Charles Martel reference can be made to such areas as: his growing dominance over the kings; the uneven relations with the Church and its period despoliation; sheer military power; leadership of armies against a range of opponents; the possible feudal genesis; missionaries' work; the importance of 732; developing papal links; the role as mayor of the Palace of consolidation of Frankish power bases. For Pepin, reference can be made to: the inheritance; the re-shaping of the Mayoral role; developments of 743–47; the role of Childeric III; relations with the Church and Papacy; the 751 elevation to the king (sacral etc.); the explicit nature of Christian kingship. Interventions in Italy; his legacy.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question sets up argument and possible counter-argument, around a range of factors and a sense of relative importance, albeit also with a sense of the connections of factors here. Here answers are likely to consider the balance between increasing Merovingian weaknesses, amidst political and military challenges, and the evident strengths of the Carolingians, seen increasingly as the 'ideal' rulers needed by the aristocracy and the Church. The Carolingians' reconstruction of a narrative of late Merovingian kingship (weak, useless) might be considered; so, too, some of the fundamentals of Carolingian emergence and eventual kingship (see AO1 areas).

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

Page 12	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

8 'Charlemagne's empire was held together simply by the strength of his personality.' Discuss this view.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative is not required here; good analysis and evaluation are required. Candidates need to be careful not to become distracted by consideration of the Wars, etc. Rather they want to use knowledge of such as of the 'empire' to illustrate and assess its very nature. They will need to consider factors such as: Charlemagne's personal qualities, military and political skills; the nature of government and administration (capitularies, *missi*, governors, etc.); the role of literacy and the Church (in administration and in sanctifying his rule); the nature of his authority; the imperial title and coronation of 800 and the consequences; his use of his family; the sheer size and spread of his lands; the need for vigilance and military activism; the possible 'decomposition' after 800 and so the last years; brief reference to his legacy after 814.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There is scope for argument and counter-argument here, with a sense of debate, not least over the meaning of empire (small 'e', big 'E') and the nature of Charlemagne's rule, with the view that time, age and physical changes made rulership a much more difficult enterprise. The aftermath of his death might be used (briefly) in assessment here (as above).

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

9 Explain the importance of Viking attacks on western continental Europe in the ninth century.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of events or a description of features will not succeed, there needs to be good analysis and evaluation of issues. Candidates need to assess reasons for success and also the impact, effects, effectiveness of that success. They will be aware of both the contemporary exaggerations of destructiveness and the greater emphasis on continuities and positives.

Candidates are likely to consider the range and scope of raids; the military and naval skills; the weaknesses and errors of opponents; the lack of strong defences in many areas; the levels of destruction and killings; the demands for gelds; the effects on trade, routes and economic activity (opening up new areas, routes, feeding new demands); the political impact, not least in the Carolingian lands and especially Northern France; the creation of new settlements and political structures; the intermingling with local populations and the transformations to social structures and customs.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There is good scope here for assessment of the positives and negatives and for awareness of debates over Viking roles and actions, reflecting changed opinions and re-examination of the evidence (literary, non-literary). It is likely that good answers will assess the Viking impact at several levels, not least the urban-commercial and the political; in both cases, the Vikings can be seen as a positive force and as an important factor in re-shaping economic and political activity. In that sense, answers are likely to reflect current thinking.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

10 How weak was the authority of the rulers of the German lands between 843 and 919?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of events and of rulers is unlikely to go very far unless there is good explanation linked to the needs of the question. Analysis and evaluation are required, set in the context of the dissolution of the Carolingian Empire and its consequences. The question is bounded by the terms of the Treaty of Verdun (843) and the accession of Henry the Fowler in 919. Reference can be made to Louis the Pious and Louis the German; to the creation and development of Saxony, Bavaria and Swabia, granted in 876 to Louis' three sons; to events between 881–87 (brief reunion, then division); to the last 'German' Carolingians (888–911) with the appearance of duchies, overlordships and lordships, the threats of invaders (Viking, Norman, Magyar-Hungarian), the marcher regions and the obvious lack of unity; to the desire of some to effect a more concentrated, recognisable and powerful royal authority (hence the 919 election – itself worthy of comment). This was a time of social unrest and weak authority, one where powerful nobles and their retinues consolidated their power; the vast territorial area then fractured along older, ducal and tribal division lines. Henry's emergence as a powerful duke, then elected as king, reflects on the prior period. Reference to towns, the church, the nature of administration and the powers plus feudal features of the aristocracy would be in order also.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question invites argument and assessment. There needs to be a good focus on 'How weak ...' and levels of weakness need to be assessed (territorial, political, military, etc.). The areas set out in AO1 will be germane to evaluation and there is debate as to the features of the period. The extent of weakness and the centrifugal forces involved for example.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

Section 3: c. 919–1099

11 How great a ruler was Otto III?

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. A narrative or description of events will not go very far unless there is explanation offered, related to the question. Analysis and evaluation are needed. Candidates will need to assess 'great' and 'greatness' as concepts in relation to reputation and the balance between image, myth and reality. The Ottonian dynasty is regarded highly, not least in forging a meaningful German identity and in the acquisition of the imperial title. A sense of Otto III's place alongside the other Ottonians would be useful, though the focus has to be on Otto III.

Reference can be made to his minority, the regencies, the nature of his inheritance; the position of royal-imperial power in Germany and Italy; his interventions in Italian politics and church affairs after 996; the relationship with the Papacy (uneven), internal revolts in Italy and their suppression (997, 1001–2); the value of the imperial title; the idea of an universal Roman Empire (recreating the ancient great Empire); the use of German resources in Italy; the power of the German aristocracy, relations with the German Church, the nature of Ottonian administration and rule; the legacy he left in 1002.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question sets up scope for argument and counter-argument, assessment of rulership qualities, the continuing problems presented by trying to devote time, energy and resources to Italy as well as Germany, the concept of Emperorship (theory and practice) and the idea of Otto III as 'the Great'.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

12 Assess the view that the early Capetian Kings (987–1108) survived because their rivals were so divided.

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. A narrative of events will not go far here; analysis and evaluation are needed, quite possibly based around key themes. Consideration will be given to the reigns of Hugh Capet, Robert II, Henry I and Philip I as well as to the roles, strengths and indeed weakness of powerful magnates, such as the Dukes of Normandy and Counts of Anjou, Blois, Champagne, Flanders and Maine. There are feudal as well as royal dimensions here. There will need to be some assessment of the power and resources of these feudal magnates and certainly analysis of the kings' capacity to survive. The latter will embrace factors such as political skills, luck, the tendency of magnates not to unite against the kings, the importance of the royal title and the general support of the Church. The feudal relationship will be explored also – suzerainty; vassalage, etc. The Capetians' success in maintaining and exploiting the royal demesne, the success in extending some parts of it, the ability to produce male heirs and to live long (luck?), their pragmatism and realism, their ability to exploit favourable opportunities, including minorities, all are added factors; so, too, the power and potency of the royal title.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question ('Assess') sets up argument and counter-argument, the assessment of external and internal factors, chance, political and personal skills, the nature of both the French kingdom and its surrounding neighbours and rivals. Answers will balance internal and external factors and put on a strong emphasis on the explanation of survival, looking at the relative importance of divided rivals set against other factors. There is debate here, not least as to how and why such a seemingly threatened dynastic family did indeed survive. There will be a sense of relative importance but also awareness of links. A contrast between positions at the start and end would be useful here.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

13 How successful was the Reconquest in Spain and Portugal in the eleventh and twelfth centuries?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative or form of description of events in the period after c. 1000 will need plenty of good embedded explanation to score at least tolerably well. Analysis and evaluation are required, with thematic structure working well here – geographical extent, military, strategic frontiers, political position of Muslim powers (etc.). ‘Reconquest’ (Reconquista) can be defined and assessed as to range, character and geographical spread. Personalities, leadership, military strategies, battles, tactics, spiritual-religious fervour, problems of ageing Muslim structures set against more vigorous Christian Kingdoms and structures, may all be considered. Portugal needs to be considered as well as Spain, even if the latter is more likely to predominate. Consideration can be given to: the progress achieved by Sancho III of Navarre and by his sons (in Leon, Castile, Aragon); Christian recovery reached the River Tagus and lower Ebro Valley; the capture of Toledo (1085) and the actions of El Cid; the position of the Almoravids and especially the Almohads in forcing a halt to further expansion; events in Portugal after 1109 and especially in 1147–48 (Lisbon, frontiers secured); Almoravid decline (1107–43: military, spiritual, moral, social); Almohad appearance and successes (e.g. 1150, 1172, 1184–99, defeating Castilian and Aragonese, pushing to the River Tagus). The boundaries created in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries can be a feature of assessment; their permanence or impermanence, how far shifting and flexible.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question formulation (‘How Successful’) sets up areas of argument and debate, with counter-argument possible; for example, a balance between Christian penetration and expansion and Muslim resistance, recovery, revival. Good answers will reflect the ebb and flow of military fortunes, settlement and re-settlement, gain and lost. Debates as to reasons and the scope and nature of success levels may well feature in assessment. An obvious area is the strength of Christian leadership and warrior activity set against a range of Muslim weaknesses and problems. Another is the lack of sustained impetus by Christian Kingdoms, sometimes the product of internal dissensions and weaknesses. (By the end of the twelfth century, the great success of 1212 would have seemed a long way off)

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

14 How significant were the issues raised by the Investiture Contest up to 1085?

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. A narrative of the Investiture Contest is not needed. Analysis and evaluation, based around key themes, is needed here. Analysis of the positions of Gregory VII and Henry IV will be necessary with a sharp focus on the issues that were raised. Henry IV can be seen to have adopted and held to a traditional position, developed over time but challenged in the reform climate that set in after mid-century. Gregory VII held to a set of ideas that appeared revolutionary in context (whether they were so is another matter – see AO2 below). These included the paramountcy of *justitia*, the sovereignty of the pope over Christian society, including bishops and kings, the need for 'suitable' office-holders in an ordered society, the illegitimacy of lay control over clerics. He made bold claims, above all the deposition of a king and the attacks on lay investiture. In many respects, he was a conservative, but came across as revolutionary ('I am custom', 'I am the truth'). Henry IV was duty bound to defend lay investiture and to react strongly against deposition; he saw himself as upholding the traditional authority and power of the Emperor and as working with a Pope, but in a position of strength and supremacy. At a wider level, the clashes can be placed into the context of the developing arguments over *potestas*, *auctoritas*, *regnum et sacerdotium* (etc.). Reference to the earlier papal reform movement (from 1046) and to Hildebrand's prior status and ideas would be useful.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There is good scope here for argument and possible counter-argument as to the issues, their impact, the roles of principles and powerful personalities. There has been much dispute over the events and issues here, not least linked to ideas of ascending or descending powers, the relationship of church and state, Papacy and Empire, the development of a recognisable and militant Gregorian reform programme. 'How significant'... opens up debate as to importance, character, content, features, the nature of the issues conflicted.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

15 Why were relations between Byzantium and the West so strained in the period 1054–1204?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of relations will not go very far here; there needs to be a clear sense and direction of analysis and evaluation. The schism of the two Churches, East and West announced and formalised in 1054, the attack of the Fourth Crusade from the boundaries here. Selective knowledge will need to be used to support analysis. The effects of the battle of Manzikert (1071) as of the various crusades may be considered in importance. The growing revival of the West and view of the East as a place for pilgrims and crusaders, the prejudices generated, the antipathy in the East (starting with Alexius Comnenus) can be linked to growing religious-ideological divergence and a coveting of the wealth of the Byzantine Empire. Mutual distrust, fears, hatreds were generated and fuelled by successive crusades and the eventual Byzantine succession dispute provided major opportunity for predatory western intervention. The attitudes of the Byzantine Emperors as of Church Leaders, of Popes and leading Western leaders, may be used to develop the theme of growing strained relations. Religion, economic and political systems and structures will provide contextual material. The three crusades prior to 1204 may be seen as highly significant and may be used to access the core of the question. There were times when relations were at least decent and the Byzantine Emperors aided the crusaders; but these were sporadic. More tellingly, from the First Crusade, distrust and enmities were generated and perpetuated. The attitudes of Emperors towards the Crusader States and issues of overlordship, set in the context of religious-political divisions, were significant.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The formulation 'Why ...' requires some ordering of factors, a sense of relative importance and an awareness of connections. There is scope for debate as for assessment, weighing Byzantine and Western views, mistrust, jealousies, antipathies and seeking comparative evaluation of such. Reasons are likely to embrace religious, political, economic, structural areas. Personalities may be seen as important.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

Section 4: 1085–1250

16 How well deserved is Frederick Barbarossa's great reputation?

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. A narrative of events will not succeed much here. Good analysis and evaluation are required. Barbarossa has been represented as something of an heroic failure, not least in respect of his activities in Italy, yet he had successes and was a powerful, major European figure. Consideration to areas of failure will be acceptable but there needs to be a decent assessment of successes, whether complete or partial. Answers may look at Italy and Germany separately but cross-overs and interactions should be appreciated, and a comparative dimension would help in analysis and evaluation. There will need to be some consideration of his known or likely aims and his sense of duty and obligation, especially as Emperor.

For Italy, likely areas of assessment are: his deteriorating relations with the Papacy, especially Alexander III; the clashes over revived imperial powers and claims set against papal; the problems with the Lombardy communes; the mixed fortunes of his military operations (e.g. 1167, 1174–76); the outcomes in 1177, where it can be argued that, while Alexander III was vindicated in his claims and as a defender of Roman advantages, Barbarossa's skill as a diplomatist offset some papal gains and cemented his control over Tuscany. By the end, Emperor and Papacy seemed reconciled. For Germany, issues surround the nature of his rule there; government and administration; the role of the Church; the unevenness of relations with the aristocracy, above all Henry the Lion; perceived feudal-political developments; his development of patrimonial lands; the sense of power and prestige later on, the succession.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There is scope for argument and counter-argument here ('How well deserved...') not least centred on the realism of Barbarossa's aims (vain? dreams and visions? a strong sense of duty, above all imperial?) and on the apparent primacy of Italy. It is possible to argue that too much focus was given to Italy and that Germany was neglected. Then again, as above, he had successes there, especially late on. Yet it can be argued that there was not that much scope for advancement in Germany (a problematic concept, anyway); that he saw himself primarily as an Emperor and that the profits from Italian involvement were used to build up a southern German base to his empire. There will need to be a secure focus on his reputation, its routes and content, possibly contemporary and posthumous.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

17 How far did Louis VI and Louis VII strengthen the French monarchy?

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. A narrative of events will not succeed much here. Analysis and evaluation are needed, possible based on key themes. A sequential approach would have some value; after all, Louis VII built on what Louis VI did. But a more comparative approach, based around key themes, would be even better. Consideration could be given to such areas as the development of the royal demesne, relations with towns and the nobility, the values of a close alliance with the Church and Papacy, the role of key advisers, defence and security, diplomacy, the success levels in warding off aggressive neighbouring rulers, the value from the royal (and feudal) powers as a king and suzerain; the careful development of both administrative structures and the husbanding of vital resources. Relations with the Emperor and with the Dukes of Normandy and Counts of Anjou – thence with the Angevin dynasty – may figure quite prominently though there are other areas to consider as well. A contrast between the royal position in 1106 and 1180 could be instructive. For Louis VI, possible or likely reference areas are: his relations with the Dukes of Normandy; his development of close ties with towns, the Church and the Papacy (eg in 1130); his use of the truce of God against rebel vassals, his intervention in Flanders (1127); the role of Suger and other able advisers; the careful management of resources.

For Louis VII, possible or likely areas are: the Aquitaine marriage and issues, 1137–52 and after; relations with the Angevin rulers; his temporary departure from his father's policies, 1137–43; the Second Crusade; his support from the Church and towns and from the Papacy; the title 'The Most Christian King'; patronage of culture; building work; the further development of administration and resources; the degree of strengths bequeathed in 1180.

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 of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question allows for argument and counter-argument, around their respective roles, continuities and changes, the balance between personal skills, luck, favourable circumstances, on-going royal enhancements. There is scope for debate, not least as to personal roles and injection of skills (etc.), set against problems of powerful rivals.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

18 How is the eventual triumph of Philip Augustus over his Angevin opponents best explained?

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. A narrative of events is not required and will not go very far; rather there needs to be good analysis and evaluation. Philip Augustus can be viewed as highly successful, creating a recognisably French monarchy and kingdom (albeit still with structural-regional-cultural differences in the South) and overcoming his Angevin rivals, then defending his gains in 1214. A contrast between the situations in 1180 and 1223 would be instructive; and the sheer longevity of the reign is worthy of comment. Here candidates will need to assess the weaknesses of opponents, principally Angevin, against a range of other factors.

Reference can be made to such areas as: the methods used to defeat the Angevins – military leadership, generalship, strategy and tactics, good use of resources, diplomacy and the use of Angevin weaknesses, especially errors made by John – and to build on that defeat (up to and including Bouvines); the development of a very strong royal administration and government, local, regional, central; the development of resources (fourfold tax increase); the relationship with the church and towns, the patronage and control of the enlarged aristocracy; the enhancement of royal suzerainty, feudal powers and rights; actions in the south of the kingdom; cultural developments, in part linked to heightened sacral kingship.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question opens up argument and counter-argument, and there is scope for debate, centred on the personality of Philip as well as the levels of skill he enjoyed and his overall political-diplomatic strategies. The length of the reign and the marked contrasts between its start and end as well as the very nature of the French kingdom created (just how united really was it?) could well be assessed here. The formulation 'best explained' invites debate, here as to Angevin errors, weaknesses, splits (etc.) set against French strengths, skills and developing power levels.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

19 How fully did Pope Innocent III achieve his aims?

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. A narrative or description of Innocent's career is not required. Analysis and evaluation are required, focused on key issues. There is a need for clear evaluation of the status of Innocent III, placed in the context of his aims and objectives as well as of the changing political and spiritual landscape of Europe. Central features will be his assertion of the key principles of papal authority and power; his interest in reforms and in crusading; his stand against heresy; his energy, activism and interventionism. His dealings with the imperial candidates, Philip Augustus and John, will be one major strand. Here there was a mixture of realism and idealism. His principles were *ratione peccati*, lord of the world, authority over emperor-making. There was strong assertion of papal authority by excommunication, interdict, etc. Yet he moved positions as well: between Otto, Philip of Swabia, Frederick, over the imperial issue; legitimising Philip Augustus' children by Agnes; the backing for John as a papal vassal. Pragmatism merged, then, with idealism. The Fourth Crusade, heresy, the Albigensian Crusade, the Lateran Council, developments in patrimonial administration and resources, are other facets for assessment. A sense of the core issues and values of the on-going arguments over *regnum* and *sacerdotium* would help here (cf. AO2 below).

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Argument and counter-argument lie here: his reputation, his impact, his ability to shape events, the extent to which such have been exaggerated, the view of him as one of the truly great medieval popes; the reasons for his high profile status and its context; the assessment of the start and end of the pontificate. Good answers are likely to contextualise Innocent's place and role, in the wider arena of papal ambitions, claims, pretensions. 'How fully...' sets up assessment of the aims (personal, institutional, ideological) set against the range of outcomes.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

20 'Frederick II's massive ambitions led to his failures.' 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. A narrative of events will not go very far here, unless there is a good level of explanation. Analysis and evaluation are required. Here, candidates will need to assess the nature and scope of Frederick II's ambitions against the outcomes and further assess the extent of failures. There is plenty of material to access and evaluate. Consideration can be given to his inheritance and his performance. The period preceding Frederick saw a protracted civil war inside Germany with much external involvement and princely territorial aggrandisement. This may have damaged the strong position created by Barbarossa – if indeed it was that strong. Frederick's position then could have been precarious there from the start. Then again the situation in Sicily was much more favourable. Candidates will need to judge whether his policies towards Germany, Sicily, the Papacy, Northern Italy, etc., were badly conceived and executed. This will relate to the nature of any achievements and the balance (or imbalance) between successes and failures. Given the breadth of his interests and the range of his activities, there are many issues that could be assessed: for example, the 'Stupor Mundi' label; the cultural background and mixture, not least Sicilian; cultural and scientific interests; his German policy, internal unrest, the roles of his sons, the extent of his authority and control there; the government of the Regno and the restoration of authority there; his imperial coronation; the Lombard League and the growing problems of order and control; the unevenness of relations with the Church and the Papacy, the clashes (and reasons), the excommunications; the interesting attitudes towards religion and crusading; the successes in the Holy Lands, the contrasts between early successes and the years c. 1245–50; the nature of the legacy.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There is good scope here for argument and counter-argument with a sense of reputation and shifting opinions as well as perspectives (Southern v. Northern European, etc.); the nature of Frederick's inheritance, the education he received, the cultural diversification, the sense of imperial mission (and destiny), the idealism v. practicalities, all could be considered here in assessment – and so how far he was actually too ambitious or simply the victim of circumstances. Successes will need to be set against failures. The question formulation invites argument and assessment of the range of ambitions set against eventual outcomes.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

Section 5: Themes c. 300–c. 1200

21 How significant were towns for economic developments either in the period c. 600–c. 900 or in the period c. 1000–c. 1200.

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. A narrative or description will not go very far here unless there is a good level of explanation linked to the needs of the question; analysis and evaluation are needed supported by a range of suitably selected examples from across the appropriate period. Both towns and trade require treatment, though not in equal measure. Towns need to be linked to economic developments in character, scope, extent, scale. Regional examples would be good. The periods are chosen to reflect limited change or development or greater change and it is likely that treatment of the first period will be thinner than the second, depending on choice, hence the selection of years. Broad evaluative issues will include such features as the size, location and population levels of towns, markets, mints, trade exchanges, charters of protection, nascent industries, good supplies, their hinterlands and place inside prevailing political structures; trade routes (land, sea, waterways), changes to such, trade volumes and content (e.g. precious metals, foodstuffs, cloth, wool, weapons, consumer items, wine). For the respective periods, reference might be expected to such areas and issues as: in c. 600–900. The aftermath of the Roman Empire, the survival of Roman settlements and/or their regeneration, refoundation; trade centres, political centres; places of protection (the effects of wars and raids); the impact of the Vikings; the needs of the Church; limited industrial activity; the movement of rural peoples into urban contexts. In c. 900–c. 1200 much of the same applied but towns grew in size; there was that much more stability and security; religious revival was a factor; so, too, increased commercial activities, more, better trade connections; a growth in urban prestige and dominance; urban identity, communes, communal activity and the consequences. In both periods trade links and movements will feature, with awareness of scale and scope, above in the second period. The economic status and roles will be predominant in both periods.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question formulation ('How significant...') invites elements of argument and counter-argument with a possible sense of debate: the role of population changes; Roman legacy areas; the stimulus of royal and church needs; the changing roles of towns (protection, trade, etc.). There will need to be good focus on economic developments, albeit probably interpreted broadly.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

22 How are the changes in population levels either in the period c. 400–c. 800 or c. 1000–c. 1200 best explained?

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. A narrative or description will not help here, unless there is a good level of explanation allied to the needs of the question. Analysis and evaluation are required, with suitably selected examples from across the breadth of the period. Reasons need to be adduced and the period has been chosen to reflect discernible shifts in population levels, density, mortality rates. Factors that might be considered: urban and rural features; life expectancy, mortality via early deaths, the effects of wars, military activity, raids, unrest; law and order impact areas; plague, disease, general nutrition and malnutrition; subsistence levels; population movement, settlement, re-settlement, colonisation effects; agricultural underpinning (food production, food types, etc.); shifts in economic activity. Candidates are likely to comment on the relatively low levels of population at the start, as Europe recovered still from the long-term effects of the end of the Roman Empire and subsequent major upheavals, and then on the perceived re-ordering and relative stabilisation between c. 1000 and c. 1100, leading to population increases. Again, regional examples will be useful and a sense of range across the period as across countries will be important. In the first period here, population fell away under the impact of the end of unity of the Roman Empire, the effects of wars, subsistence crises as agrarian-social structures faltered or broke down, the effects of diseases (e.g. sixth-century plague frequency). There was some stabilisation and slow recovery as political structures became that more settled and tolerable peace and order were restored. Of course, there were regional East-West variations. In the second period here, population was recovering; more ordered societies, more balanced agricultural systems, some decline in mortality levels, all played a part in creating the conditions for what some have seen as a 'population boom' setting in before 1200 and extending for at least another hundred years.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'How are...' invites an ordering of reasons, a sense of relative importance but with awareness of connections. The formulation 'best explained' sets up scope for argument and debate, and good answers may well show an awareness of the debates involved in explaining population changes and the issues involved.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

23 How widespread was feudalism in Europe in the period c. 900–c. 1200?

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. A narrative of feudal developments or, more likely perhaps, a description of feudal society will need much good embedded explanation to secure decent reward. Good analysis and evaluation are required, supported by examples from at least two countries. Some definition of feudalism will be needed – for example, a focus on lands, forms of service (military especially), knights, mounted forces, cavalry, homage and fealty. A focus on the upper parts of society would be in order – knight service, military retinues, political forms – but a wider social survey would be welcome, embracing lands, estates, forms of manorialism (etc.). Apart from the military and broadly social values here, there are economic and political dimensions also: means of production, farming of estates, produce levels (for sale or for a lord), possible elements of early commutation, demesne and out-lands; political constructs, devolved authority and power, 'feudal' magnates posed against weak (royal) overlords, the amalgam of royal and feudal powers (including legal and financial demands). Feudal practices could be viewed as a valuable means of maintaining law and order, not the reverse (see below AO2). The 'French' model can be assessed, set against practices elsewhere. Whether there was indeed a model, whether feudal practices changed across this long period, whether a military and political content was replaced by a more socio-economic and legal, could be assessed.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The form of the question sets up argument and counter-argument and there is plenty of scope for debate. Much has been written on feudalism, ranging from nineteenth-century views and the classic works of such as Bloch and Ganshof. Some have argued that 'feudalism' and 'feudal' are useful terms, tools, constructs; others that they have little value, indeed distort representations of early medieval society. There has been debate about how far 'feudal' has been too synonymous with lawlessness, violence, unrest, even anarchy.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

24 Why was the Third Crusade more successful than the Second Crusade?

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. A narrative of the crusades is not required; analysis and evaluation are required, linked to key themes. A comparative approach here would work well, using the events and features of each crusade to illustrate themes such as: leadership; religion; geography and climate; resources; the degrees of help from the crusader states; military strategy and tactics. A sequential approach is likely to work less well in terms of overall evaluation. Candidates will view the Second Crusade as a failure and may deem the Third to be one as well, though there is an argument that it had some successes, not least in creating a stalemate between Christian and Muslim. The aims of the Crusades need to be assessed: to drive out heathen-pagan forces, to liberate Jerusalem, to protect the remaining Crusader States (etc.). For the Second Crusade, it is relatively easy to elucidate key failure reasons: differences between crusaders and settlers; the lack of a clear and unified command structure; internal divisions in the crusading forces; some tensions between the French and Germans; the role of Manuel I Comnenus and the lack of Greek help; the strengths and greater unity of the Muslims and the leadership of Nur ed-Din; the decision to attack Damascus and the handling of that campaign; possibly exaggerated expectations and an alleged lack of crusader zeal. For the Third Crusade, reasons for (relative) success include: the leadership of Richard I; his military skills, strategy and tactics; the support he had on the ground; religious zeal as well as more practical-material considerations; the position of Saladin and the pressures on him; respective resources and the geopolitical context, including the extent of support given by settlers and the needs of avoiding major, pitched battles, as against sieges.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question formulation invites argument and counter-argument, with a sense of comparison and contrast. For example, much could be made of leadership, planning, military strategy and conduct, the composition of the crusades – the respective strengths of the Muslim opposition will also be assessed as an important factor.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

25 How is the growth of universities best explained?

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. A narrative or description will not do much to answer the question. Analysis and evaluation are required here. Some consideration needs to be given to the sense of 'universities' and also to general educational needs and changes, within which can be located the needs of key social and political groups. Examples will be needed, from Europe and Southern Europe; a sense of the scale of development will help also. Candidates may be expected to consider factors such as: the importance of cathedral schools in Northern Europe; the growing interest in Philosophy, especially Aristotle; the influence of itinerant teachers; the struggle for independence from ecclesiastical and secular authorities, the development of intellectual life in Paris; the migration of teachers from Paris, Bologna and other centres; demands for educated men to serve the secular state as administrators and lawyers; the privileges granted to schools and universities by lay and ecclesiastical rulers. The intimate connections between a spirit of enquiry, literacy, educational awareness, the needs of State and Church should feature also in higher quality answers.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There is some scope for argument and counter-argument here, with a focus upon reasons, their relative importance and yet awareness of connections between such. 'Best explained' requires an ordering of factors, an awareness of contextual issues and a sense of internal (educational, literacy) and external factors (the needs of Church and State). There is debate here, with references possible to the 'twelfth-century Renaissance' and to the upsurge in educational-intellectual interests and propagation (and the reasons attached).

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

26 How successfully did the Church respond to the challenges from heresy in the period c. 1100–c. 1250?

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. A narrative of events or a form of description of heresies and activities or responses to such will not go very far here, unless there is good explanation linked to the needs of the question. Analysis and evaluation are required, supported by suitable examples from across the designated period. Some definition and explanation of heresy – from the Church's stance – will be required. Brief reference to the reasons for its growth would be valid and a sense of geographical location and spread will help – though the focus is on the Church's response levels. Reference could be made to such factors as: the sharpening of the definitions of orthodox beliefs, practices, conduct and a hardening of attitudes towards the unorthodox; the use of Papal Bulls (e.g. 1184); the use of secular support and laws, incorporating anti-heretical measures (1220–26, Empire, Aragon, France as examples), the growth of inquisitorial agents and powers (1231, 1252, use of torture, etc.); military activity (the Albigensian Crusade); the development of the friars as a pastoral and intellectual force, combating popular and the mere 'academic' heresy; actions in and against schools, scholars, sections of universities; censorship and forms of index-based regulation; powers of excommunication and social outcast status; the exclusion from political society; the outcomes in diminution of heresies or else their survival, even resurgence (underlying, popular or esoteric, hermetical, refined, narrower).

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question offers scope for argument and counter-argument, based around the degrees of such achieved. 'How successfully ...' invites evaluation across time and geographical areas, measurement of the impact of various responses. There is scope for debate: for example, over the role of the friars, over the effectiveness of measures; over the persistence of forms and levels of heresy. It is clear that heresy or heresies were not eradicated but some remained inherent, stubborn, persistent.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

Section 6: 1250–c. 1378

27 Assess the cultural and political importance of the Kingdom of Sicily between 1250 and 1378.

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. A narrative of events or a description of features will not go very far here, unless there is good explanation. There needs to be persistent analysis and evaluation, drawing in a range of examples from across the designated period. Both cultural and political aspects need to be assessed here, though not in equal measure; it is likely that political may receive more attention.

Reference can be made to the continuing diversity of Sicily in culture and cultures (language, art, buildings, the legacy of Norman and Hohenstaufen cosmopolitanism) and the effects on administration, government and laws; the legacy of Frederick II (Manfred, etc.); papal intervention, the period of French rule (Charles, the Naples base, French influences and personnel); the Sicilian Vespers (1282); the barons' offer of the Crown to Peter of Aragon; Aragonese rule (tensions between barons, towns); the roles of Frederick III and IV as Kings; Naples-Sicily tensions and the 1372 acceptance of Sicilian independence; the resources and strategic value of Sicily in the Mediterranean; the effects of foreign rulership (Angevin, Aragonese), seen by some as damaging because of mismanagement of resources and leading to a slow economic decline.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'Assess ...' sets up evaluation and explanation, with a sense of argument; there is scope for debate. Connections will be made, a sense of relative importance offered, an awareness shown of cultural and political links – political culture also – and assessment made of the interactions between external interests, influences and involvements and internal, insular concerns. Here, for example, consideration of the effects of foreign connections and rulership will be important as will the internal reactions (urban, baronial, communal).

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

28 To what extent have the achievements of Louis IX been exaggerated?

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. A narrative of the reign will not secure much reward, unless there is much explanation embedded. Analysis and evaluation are required here. Candidates need to consider on Louis IX's personal and public life, his reputation and impact, with an awareness of the hagiography that surrounded him at the time and certainly later.

There is plenty of material from which to draw areas of assessment: personal piety and austerity of life; the Christian ideal of rulership; a very strong sense of duty to God as a King; canonisation; the concern to found and refurbish religious houses and with charitable works; a strong concern for justice, even when against the material royal interests; a concern for peace (1258, 1259 etc.); enquiries into the performance of officials; ordinances against violence, duels; a personal involvement in checking excommunications and other church penalties; a willingness to stand up to the Papacy on some issues; hostility towards heretics, blasphemers, Jews; his crusading interest. Many of these areas have links to government, justice, kingship duties of an extreme kind. The context of prevailing French royal authority and power, the development of the strengths of the monarchy and the nature of the French kingdom can be adduced as well.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There is some scope for argument and counter-argument, with a focus on reputation and importance. Much can be made of St Louis' reputation and good answers may well seek to assess any weaknesses, inherent problems, image versus realities – for example, over the actual make-up of the kingdom (regional, cultural) and over the effects of the close ties with Church and Papacy. Of course, candidates may well argue strongly in favour of his high status.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

29 'The conflict between Pope Boniface VIII and King Philip the Fair was more a matter of personalities than principles.' 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. A narrative of the conflict is not required; analysis and evaluation of the key issues, set in context, are required here. Candidates will need some contextualisation in their answers: Church-State relations; *regnum et sacerdotium*; ideas of the true location of *auctoritas* and *potestas*; ascending and descending theories of papal government; arguably trends towards the greater secularisation of rulership; the conflicts of national rulers and an international one; the growing claims to powers by a series of national rulers while the papalist position deteriorated. Personalities as well as principles mattered here as well. Candidates might point out that, for example, the arrangements Boniface made with Edward I of England did not satisfy Philip IV. A sense of the treatment of issues as of expectations on both sides would be useful also; for example, Boniface can be said to have under-estimated Philip's resolve, intransigence, stance. Reference can be made to such areas as: the growth of French royal authority, the attitude towards the Church and Papacy, 'national' ideas and assertions, a weakening of the papalist position prior to Boniface; the temperaments, personalities, ambitions of Boniface and Philip; the abdication of Celestine V and the use made of this by the French; clerical taxation in France and the decretal *Clericis Laicos*; subsequent pronouncements and clashes over clerical taxation and papal revenues (reference might be made to papal and royal responses); the case of Bernard Saisset; papal bulls culminating in *Unam Sanctam*; the attack on Boniface by de Nogaret in 1303; the outcome; the support Philip enjoyed (public opinion well managed, assemblies, national feeling, for example); problems Boniface faced elsewhere (Sicily, Venice-Genoa, revolt of the Calonna).

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question sets up argument and assessment; with a possible sense of debate. Good answers will reflect on conflict, the context (above) and the features, including the key issues over authority, power, pretensions, royalist and papal positions. A sense of perspective – hence of importance and significance – will be a feature of good answers. Explanation will be to the fore.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

30 How convincing is the view that the Avignon period was an absolute disaster for the Papacy?

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. A description or form of narrative of the Avignon Papacy in terms of key events and features is not required. Candidates need to assess its origins and longevity in the context of papal authority, power and position. There needs to be a keen sense of possible or actual damage done, but also awareness of any possible benefits accruing. The negatives are relatively easy to identify and assess: for example, loss of esteem, prestige and 'universality'; a perception of the papacy as a puppet of the French monarchy (this had implications, for example, for the Hundred Years' War); a gain in the authority of the cardinals was damaging to the role of 'papal monarchy'; the contempt that arose in respect of the luxury and corruption associated with Avignon; weakened control over Italian lands; the precursor to the Great Schism. But some possible positives would be: the papacy gained security by being away from the turbulence of Rome and Italy; the development of a more sophisticated administrative and judicial system; some ability to institute a range of reforms; gains in wealth.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There is scope for argument and counter-argument as to issues of reputation, status, legacy. For example, was the Avignon period that much of a disaster? Have its deleterious effects been exaggerated? Were there significant benefits, after all? What of perspectives, short- and long-term? What of the legacy, the connection to the Great Schism? What of the 'fit' to evaluation of the condition of the late Medieval Papacy?

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

31 How far, and why, were the Italian city states able to develop their independence in the fourteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of developments or some form of description will not go very far here. Good analysis and evaluation are needed. Examples of city states will be needed (e.g. Florence, Milan, Pisa, Venice, Genoa). There should be a sense of common features and also differences over the century, with awareness of the disparities between pre- and post-plague periods. Political, economic, commercial, social and strategic factors will be assessed; also, the beginnings of what was to develop into the Italian Renaissance. There will be a good focus on urban culture, trade, banking and credit, patronage, civic politics, educational benefits, the growth of urban elites and so hegemonic, hierarchical politics. Local and regional examples will be important and contrasts made between c. 1300 and c. 1400, involving urban-artisan unrest, guild politics, rivalries, wealth and poverty, republican ideas, the legacy of earlier communal politics and policies. Local warfare, often intense and economically damaging, the collapse of the banking houses of Peruzzi and Bardi in Florence (1340s) and the damage of the Black Death (1348 and after), oligarchic and despotic rulers and ruling families emerging later in the century, all are further features. Good answers will consider continuities, similarities and differences, fluctuating fortunes (often literal).

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There is scope for some argument and counter-argument as to the character and extent of city state developments – economic, financial, social, political – and how far these were uniform, how far different, how far shaped by external factors and forces. Change and continuity can be assessed here; vicissitudes; a mix of economic, social, political and cultural issues. 'How far' and 'why' both need coverage; there will be clear links and there will be a good focus on the independence of the northern city states in particular and the consequences of such.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 37	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

Section 7: c. 1378–c. 1461

32 Account for the economic and financial influence of the city states of northern Italy 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. Some flexibility in terms of chronology can be allowed and, in the definition of 'northern' and 'city states' but Naples and Amalfi, for example, should not be included. Some examples will need to be provided and might include Florence, Siena, Venice, Genoa, Milan and Pisa. Explanation and assessment are required rather than description. Examples of economic and financial influence should be provided – industry (such as metalwork, armaments and textiles), banking and credit facilities, overseas trade. It should be stressed that such influence had deep roots but good answers may well attempt to explain why the influence of the city states was particularly important at this time. Among the factors at work, candidates may be expected to explore the following: geographical position between Western Europe, the Mediterranean and the Near East and between northern and southern Europe; political independence and the flourishing of urban communities and civic traditions; maritime power (Pisa, Genoa, Venice); long experience in banking and other financial services; accumulation of capital in the hands of powerful families; recovery of population levels, relationships with the Papacy, financial and political (e.g. Florence); the particular combination of commerce, industry and finance; relatively open societies; social mobility and the willingness of the lesser nobility to enter into commerce and finance; the development of sophisticated financial techniques (double-entry book keeping was well established and also bills of exchange, insurance policies and early forms of cheques).

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Candidates may well speculate as to the success of the city states against a background of rivalry and internecine strife.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 38	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

33 How accurate is the view that the strength of the dukes Of Burgundy in this period depended on the weaknesses of the kings of France?

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. There can be some flexibility in the chronology but candidates should demonstrate a sound coverage of the ducal reigns of Philip the Bold (1364–1404), John the Fearless (1404–1419), Philip the Good (1419–67). A comparison with the reign of Charles the Bold (1467–77) might be relevant to the argument. A good, balanced argument is required – the strengths of Burgundy and the personal qualities of the dukes alongside the problems and weaknesses of the kings of France. Answers should demonstrate a sense of perspective and the contrasts between the reigns of Charles VI and Charles VII. Apart from the personal qualities of the dukes answers may be expected to discuss the wealth of the Burgundian territories (agriculture, commerce and industry); the resources available to the rulers; a magnificent court, international influence. The weaknesses of the French monarchy may be identified as follows: the incapacity of Charles VI; the war with England; a powerful and independent nobility; particularism; weak finances. The importance of Burgundy's relationship with both England and France should be stressed and the significance of the Peace of Arras (1435) noted.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here answers may be expected to point up the significance of the end of the Hundred Years War and the French victory and to assess the extent of the recovery of the French monarchy under Charles VII. Meanwhile, it might be noted, Burgundy suffered from some weaknesses itself: the heterogeneous nature of its territories; the variety of customs, privileges and jurisdictions; scattered and extended territories; communications. Further stress might be laid upon the fate of Burgundy after 1477.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 39	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

34 Why, and with what immediate consequences, did Constantinople fall to the Ottoman Turks in 1453?

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. This is a two-part question so a good balance will be required. The question requires a clear focus on 'immediate' consequences; there can be some flexibility in defining this but discussion of longer term outcomes should be avoided. The chronology of the section could determine this. The fall will need to be explained (rather than be described) and the consequences assessed for Christendom, for the Ottomans and for the thousand-year-old city itself (and the concept of Byzantium). Some accounts of events before 1453 will be relevant but plain narrative will need to be avoided. This should include the longer term expansion of the Ottomans, their expansion in Anatolia, their change of direction and focus towards the Balkans and Greece. It should be noted that the siege of 1453 was not the first. Alongside this the longer term weaknesses of Byzantium should be assessed. Among the more immediate explanations, candidates are likely to consider: the leadership of Murad II and Mohammed II; the quality of the Ottoman forces and their artillery in particular; the lack of any substantial aid to Constantinople from the West. In dealing with consequences, candidates are likely to assess the significance of the following: the strategic and economic importance of the city to the Ottomans; a base for further expansion by land and sea; the development of Ottoman naval power, Muscovy's attempt to inherit the mantle of Byzantium; the impact on western Christendom and the failure to launch a crusade; longer term consequences for Christendom and the security of the central and western Mediterranean.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. A further line of argument might be to trace the longer term causes of the fall of the city. For example, did the Fourth Crusade sound the knell of Byzantium? Was the fall of Constantinople in some sense 'inevitable'? Why did the city not fall before? Was the fall of Constantinople a dramatic turning point or simply the outcome of a continuous process? Was the significance of the fall of the city symbolic and psychological rather than actual? How convincing is the argument that the Ottoman conquest actually preserved 'Byzantinism'? How significant were the intellectual, cultural and artistic consequences for the West?

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 40	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

35 Assess the relative importance to the Hussite movement of religious and political considerations.

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. Successful arguments will stress the relative importance of the relevant factors in terms of motivation and support and whether religious ideas and teaching inspired political and material considerations or vice versa. A good sense of balance will be important. Among the issues to be considered are the following. The popularity of Hussite Wycliffite teaching – communion in both kinds, reform of corrupt clergy, the reduction of Church property. National Czech sentiment in Bohemia and its association with Hussitism. The embracing of Hussite teaching by the Czech masters of the university of Prague and its rejection by German masters. Disputes between Wenceslas IV and the Church over finance, justice and administration and the King's withdrawal of support from the Roman pope after the Council of Pisa. The large number of gentry and nobles supporting the Hussites after Hus's execution. The death of Wenceslas IV in 1419 which led to the intervention of Sigismund, King of the Romans. He was accepted in areas of Bohemia where Germans were numerous but rejected elsewhere. Hussite resistance began in earnest in 1419 (Zizka). At this point, a review of the motives of Wenceslas, Sigismund and the Hussite leaders would be helpful.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. The argument might be sharpened here by demonstrating the interconnectedness of religious/anticlerical/political/economic and nationalist motives. Candidates might also draw distinctions between the more moderate Utraquists and the Taborites who were political and social as well as religious radicals.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 41	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

36 Assess the strengths and weaknesses of Poland-Lithuania 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. Assessment and analysis are required with a balanced coverage of strengths and weaknesses. Among the strengths candidates are likely to discuss the following. The qualities of Wladyslaw (Jagello) as King of Poland (succeeded 1386). His partnership with his cousin Witold, governor and then prince of Lithuania (1401). Successful wars against the Teutonic Knights including a great victory at Grunwald (1410). The gaining of Samogitia, thus separating the territories of the Teutonic Knights in East Prussia from those of the Knights of the Sword in Livonia. The expansion of Poland-Lithuania eastwards at the expense of Muscovy. Wladyslaw II's avoidance of a commitment to the Hussites and the development of a collaborative relationship with the Catholic Church. In considering weakness, candidates are likely to deal with the following. The union of Poland-Lithuania was not easy to maintain – a personal union rather than a unitary state. Poland-Lithuania had numerous rivals and enemies – Tartars, Muscovy, the Teutonic Knights and Knights of the Sword, the Turks, Sigismund of Hungary. A powerful nobility which took advantage of the death of Wladyslaw II and the succession of his son Wladyslaw III who was a minor. The premature death of Wladyslaw III in battle (1444) and a resulting succession crisis. Numerous national and religious minorities within the frontiers. The complexity of the constitution and system of government.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. A sharp sense of analysis is to be expected as to the balance between strengths and weaknesses and it might be argued that some characteristics of Poland-Lithuania demonstrated both, for example, the vast size of the state.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 42	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

Section 8: c. 1461–c. 1516

37 To what extent, and in what ways, did the Valois kings extend their authority within France between 1461 and 1515?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Explanation and assessment are required rather than description and narrative, The chronological focus is upon the reigns of Louis XI (1461–83), Charles VIII (1483–98), Louis XII (1498–1515). However, it would be relevant to comment briefly upon the achievements of Charles VII and the significance of the expulsion of the English. There are two elements to the question so a balanced treatment is necessary, although the question should not be approached too rigidly as a ‘two-parter’ since there are close links between the elements. Answers might well begin with the difficulties faced by Louis XI on his accession, for example, considerable opposition from powerful nobles especially in the form of the League of the Common Weal. This problem was eased by the death of Charles the Bold of Burgundy (1477) and Louis was able to exploit this by the seizure of the duchy of Burgundy proper, of the Franche Comte, Artois and Picardy. This securing of the frontiers of the kingdom (so some consideration of diplomacy may be necessary) and consolidating its territorial integrity was pursued in other ways (for example, the bringing of Provence, the Beaujolais, Maine, Roussillon and Cerdagne under direct monarchical control). Among the other aspects of royal policies and/or achievements to be considered are the following: the subordination of the Parlement of Paris; infrequent calling of the Estates-General; control over senior appointments in the Church (building on the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges), use of the royal council and attempts to free it from noble domination; encouragement of trade and industry.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates may be expected to sharpen their assessments of ‘to what extent’. It might be argued, for example, that Louis XI failed fully to exploit the demise of Valois Burgundy. A powerful nobility still remained and Louis XI was fortunate in the deaths of some great nobles, for example, Charles of Orleans. Provincialism remained strong and little was done to reduce the venality and privileges of office-holders. There was a crisis of authority on the accession of Charles VIII. Candidates may also assess the respective contributions of the three kings and debate the wisdom of the intervention in Italy and its impact upon domestic concerns.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 43	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

38 Who gained and who lost from the Italian wars of 1494–1516?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. The chronological dimensions of the question relate to the period from the invasion of Italy by Charles VIII to the accession of Charles of Habsburg as King of Spain and the Treaty of Noyon although the battle of Marignano (1515) could represent a convenient stopping point. Argument and explanation are required rather than a catalogue of events or a simple balance sheet. Nevertheless a framework of major events and turning points with the necessary analysis could well make for a successful approach, but the period should be considered as a whole. The main participants can be identified as follows: the Papacy; France; Aragon/Spain; the Emperor; Venice; Naples; Milan; the Swiss. The argument may be expected to be built upon the following losses and gains. France gained Milan and the negotiation of the Concordat of Bologna as well as the glory and prestige of military success. The Papacy emerged territorially stronger but had made enemies. The Spanish kingdoms secured Naples. As a result of its alliance with France at Marignano, Venice was restored to the frontiers it held in 1494. Milan and Naples and their ruling families, respectively Sforza and Ferrante passed under foreign control. The invasion of Milan by the Emperor Maximilian failed and he was left diplomatically isolated. The Swiss, it might be argued, emerged as losers. They were forced to cede their bases in Lombardy, their military reputation was damaged and they pledged service to France in future wars. It would also be relevant to comment on the devastation caused by military campaigns, the extent of damage done to cities and the economy and the sufferings of the commons.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here the argument could be sharpened by a discussion of gains and losses in relative terms and the consequences for the balance of power and great power rivalry for the future.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 44	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

39 How seriously was Christian Europe threatened by the Ottoman Turks in the period 1451–1520?

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. The chronological dimensions of the question are the reigns of Mohammed II (1451–81), Bayezid (1481–1512) and Selim I (1512–20). An assessment of 'how seriously' will be essential to success and narrative accounts should not be highly rewarded. An important part of the answer is the extent of the opportunities available and exploited by the capture of Constantinople strategic, economic, religious, naval and military – but candidates will need to go beyond this for really successful answers. Besides the threat represented by the Turks, answers should recognise that the response of western Christendom was muted and appeals for a Crusade fell largely on deaf ears. Answers will need to assess the significance of Turkish incursions into Greece and the Balkans, the threat to the trading empires of Genoa and Venice and to their position in the Aegean and the Adriatic.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Fluctuation in the seriousness of the threat might be commented upon. The reign of Bayezid was one of relative stagnation as far as a westward policy was concerned. Furthermore, the Ottomans had other concerns besides Christendom, especially towards the Mameluks of Syria and Egypt and the Shah of Persia. They were a particular concern for Selim II. Other issues for debate are: whether the nature and seriousness of the threat was perceived to be more serious than previously and the extent of the foundations laid for a further westward expansion.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 45	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

40 'The policies of Maximilian I were driven entirely by dynastic considerations.' 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. Successful arguments will demonstrate a sharp focus on the dimensions of 'entirely' or, at least, the primacy of dynastic considerations. The main lines of the answer may be expected to be as follows. Maximilian's demonstration of his concern to further the interest of the Habsburgs before his election as Emperor. His marriage to Mary of Burgundy which put the Burgundian Netherlands into his hands and a claim to the rest of the Burgundian inheritance. The marriage of his son, Philip the Fair, to Joanna of Castile which resulted in Philip's claim to the throne of Castile and his grandson Charles inheriting the Spanish kingdoms. Claims to the thrones of Bohemia and Hungary were furthered by the marriages of Maximilian's grandchildren into the Jageno family. Maximilian's own marriage to Bianca Sforza of Milan had dynastic aims but also reflected the historic claims of the Empire in northern Italy. Other policies included the consolidation of the Habsburg position in southern 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 importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here answers may be expected to give closer attention to alternatives such as strategic considerations, personal prestige and the reform of imperial institutions. Maximilian's policies seem to lead directly to the formidable Habsburg monarchy of Charles V but how much was this a result of foresight rather than chance and unforeseen deaths?

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 46	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

41 How fully did Ferdinand and Isabella achieve their aims?

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. Successful answers will require a clear identification of aims and a conscious evaluation of 'how fully'. In addressing these requirements the following issues are likely to be raised. The assertion of Isabella's claim and the defeat of Joanna and the Portuguese. The conquest of Granada thus completing the Reconquista. A religious policy which included increased control over and reform of the Church and a favourable adjustment of relations with the papacy. Reform of the administration, government and finances and the maintenance of good relations with the towns. Restoration of order, enforcing the law and upholding justice. The pursuit of religious orthodoxy, and, possibly, racial 'purity' involving policies towards the Jews and Moors, conversos and moriscos. To conclude successful dynastic marriages. The expansion of the economy. The assertion of authority over the nobility and the recovery of alienated crown lands. To secure the frontiers and to pursue ambitions in Italy and the Mediterranean and in transoceanic exploration and expansion.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates may be expected to demonstrate the differences between Castile and Aragon and to assess the extent to which the policies of the Catholic Kings applied to both. How far did the interests of Castile and Aragon diverge? In what sense, if at all, did Ferdinand and Isabella aim for a united Spain?

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

Section 9: Themes c. 1200–c. 1516

42 Assess the social and cultural significance of the development of chivalry in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A description or narrative form here will not do much to answer the question, unless there is explanation involved. Analysis and evaluation are required, with examples from across the designated period. Social and cultural are linked, so there does not need to be sense of balance in the coverage. Reference can be made to the concept and code of chivalry; its upper social values and purpose; literary and pictorial representations; knights and knightly roles and codes of behaviour; education; social mores; religious orders and the links to monastic and other spiritual values and aspirations; the role of chivalry vis-à-vis courts, courtly life, ladies; the concept of the perfect warrior and 'gentleman'; the emergence of chivalric orders (e.g. beginnings of later Golden Fleece, Garter, etc.); royal involvement and patronage; the extent to which all this did shape, if at all, social and political conduct; the role as a form and means of social control. Some range of supporting examples will be required – preferably across several 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 factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question form ('assess ...') invites explanation and assessment, relative importance and, here, a sense of ideals and idealism set against realities. There is scope for debate: for example, the idea of a code of conduct for feudal society's elites; the idea of the 'christianisation' of that society and its knights; the extent of social control implied and enacted; the impact on a very hierarchical society; the literary as against practical dimensions. Good answers are likely to draw out cultural dimensions, suitably illustrated.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

43 How important were the changes in the visual arts in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries? (In your answer you should refer to at least two of: painting, illuminations, stained glass and works in metal, stone and ivory.)

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. A description of art forms will not do much here. Analysis and evaluation are required, supported by suitably selected examples from the designated period. Candidates may range widely in their interpretation of 'art' or focus on a narrow field (as above). Reference can be made to areas such as: Romanesque and Gothic influences; possible Spanish-Arab in places; the production of colours and of glass, the preparation of glass; religious links, secular needs; statues, windows, ornaments and monuments; representative features (biblical, non-biblical); goldsmiths, silversmiths, porcelain makers; illuminations (including manuscripts, books); pre-Renaissance features, colours, motifs, styles; the sense of transition in some parts of Europe; the pace and scale of developments and their purpose in society (upper, lower, etc.).

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'How important ...' invites assessment of importance, place, role and purpose. There can be argument as to such, perhaps linked to a sense of change or continuity across the period. Impact, responses, social-political-religious facets will all be elements of assessment here.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

44 How effectively did the Church deal with the problems of heresy in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of events would need much good embedded explanation to score tolerably well. Analysis and evaluation are needed, supported by suitable examples from the designated period. Candidates need to define and explain problems, including heresy and its forms as well as the weaknesses of the Church. Although there are some links, this is not a question about the origins and causes of the Reformation. Reference can be made to areas and issues such as: the character, nature and extent of heresies, popular, local, regional, more elitist; the importance of remnants of earlier heresies (e.g. Waldensians) and of the Hussites; social as well as spiritual appeal; doctrinal and practical features; bids for popular endorsement of ideas against traditional beliefs, orders, institutions, the problems of the Church in being unable to quash heretical movements; the issues raised about (e.g.) papal authority, episcopal control, the quality of the priesthood, the nature of religious teaching and education; corruption; the interpretation of the scriptures; wider contexts of growing Church-State relations, rising 'national' feelings, at times 'blind eye' attitudes of some secular authorities. Persistence of heresy suggests weaknesses in 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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question has two parts; both need answering, though not equally – 'How effectively' opens up scope for argument, assessment and debate. For example, why was heresy almost ingrained? how extensive was it? what made Hussitism so significant? what were the key weaknesses of the Church and its leadership that both encouraged heretical ideas and attacks and failed to stop such? Good answers may well make some links (possibly via Huss) to the genesis of the later Reformation but they need a good focus on the question as set here.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

45 How are the artistic and cultural achievements of the city states of fifteenth-century Italy best explained?

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. The question requires candidates to explore a range of explanations and to evaluate their relative importance. Answers should not be essays on art history alone but related to wider historical themes, social, economic, religious and political. Coverage need not be exhaustive but answers should range beyond painting and sculpture to a consideration of achievements in, for example, architecture, the writing of history, political treatises, scientific and medical works, the study of classical texts and exploration of the concept of the 'human spirit'. The best answers will provide examples. Answers should also provide examples of particular city states such as Florence, Urbino, Siena and Venice. In explaining artistic and cultural achievements candidates are likely to refer to the following. Patronage, which was not a new phenomenon and was not confined to the city states, but flourished particularly in this environment. An accumulation of wealth from banking, internal trade, collection of papal taxes and industrial activity. The nature and status of city states in terms of autonomy and independence, values of 'liberty', a sophisticated citizenry which included nobles and gentry as well as merchants, the absence of a 'universal censor' and, thus, considerable intellectual freedom and a spirit of enquiry. Add to this high literacy rates, ambitious civic buildings and other ventures, the virtues of 'civic life' and the continuity with civic traditions of the past. An integrated society of merchants, bankers, nobles and gentry provided a kind of model for Castiglione's 'Courtier'.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here a sharper evaluation of relative importance is to be expected as well as a sense of the interconnections between a variety of factors. Strong answers may well take care not to over idealise the city states.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 51	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

46 To what extent, and why, were Jews treated as outcasts in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Answers need not necessarily cover the whole chronology but a sound and balanced treatment should be expected with a good range of examples. Candidates may well choose to begin with the 'why' element of the question. As far as the Church was concerned Jews had been declared 'outcasts' by St Augustine and were regarded as 'Christ-killers'. In canon law Jews were tolerated but were liable to prosecution for heresy if they were lapsed converts. Thus, the Church presented Jews as a spiritual danger. Meanwhile, in society more widely Jews were regarded as a social and physical threat and in popular superstition, represented as ritual murderers and poisoners of wells. Generally speaking, Jews were forbidden to own land, to become full citizens or be members of guilds. Thus Jews concentrated on commerce and money lending. Their role as bankers afforded them some protection but were liable to their loans being reneged upon and to expulsion. At times of social distress and natural disaster, famine and plague Jews were especially vulnerable to persecution. In fifteenth-century Spain conversos were less disadvantaged than marranos but were nevertheless, subjected to popular persecution in Toledo and Ciudad Real. Before 1492 conversos were not persecuted on religious grounds, although 'secret Jews' were. Segregation was decreed by the Cortes of Castile in 1480 and there was systematic persecution after the fall of Granada with the resulting expulsion and destruction of Spanish Jewry. A similar diaspora took place from Portugal. Elsewhere Jews were expelled from Cracow and Lithuania in the 1490s, there were expulsions from many German cities in the early fifteenth century and from some Italian cities in the late-fifteenth century. Local circumstances played an important part. In the sixteenth century ghettos were created, for example in Venice in 1516. Answers may also be expected to discuss the mixed response of Lutheranism to the Jews, at first broadly favourable but later hostile and, ironically Charles V protected Jews in a number of German cities. The impact of the Counter/Catholic Reformation on Jewish communities might also be assessed, persecution was especially severe under Pius V (1566–72) an example followed by some lay rulers. The inflation of the sixteenth century contributed to economic insecurity for which Jews were sometimes blamed.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here answers might be concerned with differences in treatment of the Jews according to place, chronology and particular events. Although it failed, there was an attempt at dialogue, for example in the Jewish-Christian debates at Tortosa (1413–14). Again some Jewish communities remained active in business and commerce, during the sixteenth century, for example, in Ancona, Livorno, Genoa, Naples.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 52	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	21

47 Why was it that Portugal and Spain took the lead in European overseas exploration in the late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. The focus of the question is upon exploration rather than conquest and the approach will need to be explanatory and analytical rather than descriptive. However, some indication of the range and scale of exploration will be necessary together with examples of expeditions and voyages. A good balance between Portuguese and Spanish endeavours should be achieved but not necessarily equal. Answers may be expected to discuss motives as well as the advantages and other factors which enabled Portugal and Spain to take the lead. Answers are likely to deal with the following issues. Existing interests before the great age of exploration: Portugal's history of crusading and participation in the slave trade in North Africa and its possession of Ceuta; Spain's position in the Canaries. Religious motives including Portugal's voyages along the African coast with a view to outflanking Islam and making contact with 'Prester John'. For Spain, the conquest of Granada in 1492 provided a good deal of the inspiration for Columbus's voyage in the same year. The part played by ruling families: Henry the Navigator, John II and Manuel I of Portugal; Ferdinand and Isabella and Charles I of Spain. The role of material motives in driving exploration, for example, bullion, slaves, trade with the East via an Atlantic route. The availability to both Spain and Portugal of navigational and geographical knowledge and ship design. The role of individuals such as Dias, de Gama, Cabral, Balboa, Albuquerque, Columbus, Magellan.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Candidates might extend the argument into the issues as to why other Atlantic-facing states did not take the lead, for example, France and England.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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.