



General Certificate of Education

History 5041/6041

Alternative B Europe in Transition, c1470–1610

Mark Scheme

2005 examination – June series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS and A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's revised AS/A2 History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specifications. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by AS and A2 level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS/A2 level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The revised specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the new specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for AS and A2.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other alternatives and across all the specifications offered by the Board.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B for AS and Section C for A2) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section D).

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

Level 1:

The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will

- be excessively generalised and indiscriminating with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

Level 2:

Either

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer a relevant but outline only description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but limited grammatically.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

Level 5:

As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing,
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

C: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS

The relationship between the Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1.1, 1.2 and 2 and the Levels of Response.

A study of the generic levels of response mark scheme will show that candidates who operate solely or predominantly in AO 1.1, by writing a narrative or descriptive response, will restrict themselves to a maximum of 6 out of 20 marks by performing at Level 1. Those candidates going on to provide more explanation (AO 1.2), supported by the relevant selection of material (AO1.1), will have access to approximately 6 more marks, performing at Level 2 and low Level 3, depending on how implicit or partial their judgements prove to be. Candidates providing explanation with evaluation and judgement, supported by the selection of appropriate information and exemplification, will clearly be operating in all 3 AOs (AO 2, AO1.2 and AO1.1) and will therefore have access to the highest levels and the full range of 20 marks by performing in Levels 3, 4 and 5.

Level 1:

Either

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such answers will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristic: they

- will lack direction and any clear links to the analytical demands of the question
- will, therefore, offer a relevant but outline-only description in response to the question
- will be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

- lack any significant corroboration
- be generalised and poorly focused
- demonstrate limited appreciation of specific content
- be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

IT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THIS TYPE OF RESPONSE AND THOSE WHICH ARE SUCCINCT AND UNDEVELOPED BUT FOCUSED AND VALID (appropriate for Level 2 or above).

Level 2:*Either*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

- understanding of some but not all of the issues
- some direction and focus demonstrated largely through introductions or conclusions
- some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of the language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

- arguments which have some focus and relevance
- an awareness of the specific context
- some accurate but limited factual support
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

- the approach will be generally analytical but may include some narrative passages which will be limited and controlled
- analysis will be focused and substantiated, although a complete balance of treatment of issues is not to be expected at this level nor is full supporting material
- there will be a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed, not fully convincing or which may occasionally digress into narrative
- there will be relevant supporting material, although not necessarily comprehensive, which might include reference to interpretations
- effective use of language, appropriate historical terminology and coherence of style.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope.

Exemplification/guidance

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

- sustained analysis, explicitly supported by relevant and accurate evidence
- little or no narrative, usually in the form of exemplification
- coverage of all the major issues, although there may not be balance of treatment
- an attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or summary
- effective skills of communication through the use of accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

Level 5:

As Level 4 but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 5 will be differentiated from Level 4 in that there will be:

- a consistently analytical approach
- consistent corroboration by reference to selected evidence
- a clear and consistent attempt to reach judgements
- some evidence of independence of thought, but not necessarily of originality
- a good conceptual understanding
- strong and effective communication skills, grammatically accurate and demonstrating coherence and clarity of thought.

D: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

These principles are applicable to both the Advanced Subsidiary examination and to the A level (A2) examination.

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: “What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?” Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where the level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates’ responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making a decision away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answer, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid “bunching” of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills:** generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
- well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid “double jeopardy”. Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from the lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

Alternative B: Europe in Transition, c1470–1610

AS Unit 1: Religious change and its consequences in sixteenth-century Europe

Question 1

- (a) Use **Source C** and your own knowledge.

Explain briefly the significance of “Anabaptism” in the context of the Reformation.
(3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. refers to the growth of ‘fringe’ groups which were different/extreme in organisation and religious views. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. the source indicates they were a minority but also shows understanding that they posed a threat to the acceptance of the Reformation because of their extremism. Should be able to offer some references to events such as Munster and/or indication of beliefs and practices, e.g. adult baptism, polygamy, milleniarist beliefs etc. **2-3**

- (b) Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

Explain how **Source A** differs from **Source B** in its view of how the Protestant Church was organised.
(7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

Whilst candidates are expected to deploy own knowledge in assessing the degree to which the sources differ/the utility of the source, such deployment may well be implicit and it would be inappropriate to penalise full and effective answers which do not explicitly contain ‘own knowledge’. The effectiveness of the comparison/assessment of utility, will be greater where it is clear that the candidates are aware of the context; indeed, in assessing utility, this will be very significant. It would be inappropriate, however, to expect direct and specific reference to ‘pieces’ of factual content.

- L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context, e.g. Luther thought bishops should be abolished; Calvin saw no real role for a large/extended hierarchy of officers such as bishops but did not reject them totally. He created four groups in Geneva. **1-2**
- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge, e.g. both agree that bishops are not essential; Source B would replace them with another kind of hierarchy (pastors etc.) but Source A suggests a flatter profile of people as equals; both agree that preaching is important but own knowledge might suggest that Calvin formalised this more in the Genevan church

with the establishment of pastors, the grabeau etc. Answers might also refer to the extent to which the church was involved in the community, e.g. the consistory in Geneva, whereas Lutheran churches were looser in structure. **3-5**

L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. as above and concludes that there was a similar emphasis on preaching and the importance of involving the congregation. However, the hierarchies established were different for each reformer – Lutheran churches depended more on his leadership whereas Calvinist leadership was more diffuse through the deacons, elders, the role of the Consistory etc. Calvinism saw the Church and society as indivisible; Lutheranism made the Church more approachable but still distinct. **6-7**

(c) Use **Sources A, B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

Explain the significance of strong personal leadership, in relation to other factors, in explaining the establishment of the Reformation in the early sixteenth century.

(15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations, which could apply to almost any time and/or place, based *either* on own knowledge *or* the sources. **1-4**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Or

Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and contain some assertion. **5-8**

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, some understanding of the demands of the question. **9-11**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit and partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

References to **both** Luther and Calvin should be expected for Level 3 and above. Mention might also be made by name of Anabaptist leaders such as Hutter and Matthys. An immediate contrast could be drawn between the survival and growth of both Lutheranism and Calvinism through strong individual leadership and the provision of the structures outlined in Sources A and B, in contrast to the collapse of Anabaptism as a main stream movement as a result of the weak leadership and lack of control over supporters demonstrated by events at Munster (Source C). Differences between Luther and Calvin may also be discussed, e.g. Source A indicates that Luther's churches were bound by common beliefs, Source B that Calvin's church was united under the four ministries. In both cases, a unity of belief and approach was generated. However, this was not so inflexible that it could not accommodate to changing political circumstances, e.g. Calvinists in Germany were never as theocratic as in Geneva. Anabaptists, in contrast, failed to establish clear views on issues such as property, marriage etc. In addition they went beyond the political and social tolerances of 16th century society; their attempts to create a 'new society' resulted in multiple versions with no clear vision or structure and internal divisions which relegated them to the sidelines; this is seen in the 'dispersal' after Munster, e.g. the Mennonites, the Swiss Brethren, the Hutterites etc.

Other factors should also be considered which aided the establishment of the Reformation, e.g. the weaknesses of the Catholic Church, the support given to Lutheranism by the princes and the towns, sometimes for their own political ends, and by the Genevans to Calvin for the same reason; the influence of the printing press and the political background in Germany under Charles V which made it open to change.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what was meant by "humanism" in the context of early sixteenth-century Europe. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. study of the language of the Bible and its meaning; the movement 'ad fontes', back to the original texts. 1
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. as Level 1 and may link to the work of Erasmus and possibly also to education/printing/expansion of knowledge etc. 2-3

- (b) Explain why Luther's 'Ninety-Five Theses' generated so much controversy in Germany in 1517. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. he was criticising the Church/papacy; they were widely circulated via the printing press. 1-2

-
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. as above and – Luther wanted to stimulate academic debate on the issues; the Archbishop of Mainz and Tetzel reacted strongly and fuelled the debate; the Pope became involved and sent Cardinal Cajetan to bring Luther back into the fold because he was implicitly denying the supremacy of the Papacy; led to public debate with Eck and the burning of the papal bull; Catholicism was unpopular. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. as for Level 2 and suggests that Luther’s clear exposition and ideas clarified long held grievances and tapped into the unpopularity of Catholicism. **6-7**
- (c) “The Lutheran Reformation brought about extensive change in the organisation of religion in Germany during the sixteenth century.”
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. *(15 marks)*
- Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*
- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
Or
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

Organisation – e.g. the Pope was replaced by the princes and the town councils in sanctioning the new religion and its procedures. Confession, absolution, penance etc. were no longer required practices; belief in purgatory was no longer valid; the intercession of saints, indulgences etc vanished and the mass was replaced by communion. Sermons had more significance. Worship became simpler and more accessible to all – not in Latin – a learning

exercise rather than a passive experience (although Luther kept vestments, paintings, sculpture, organ music etc). The use of Latin disappeared, clergy married and relics were no longer venerated. Popular preaching, sermons and hymn singing became important. Good works were no longer essential to achieve salvation but to be undertaken naturally and with good will.

However, there was little uniformity; much depended on the attitude of the ruling body. Some areas remained staunchly Catholic. Literacy rates were low and much depended on what was understood and remembered by the faithful. Clerical marriage did not end illicit relationships and the clergy remained an elite, often university graduates; there is evidence that the ordinary people were no less ignorant of Christian beliefs after the Lutheran reformation than they were before.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what was meant by “the church hierarchy” in the context of the unreformed Catholic Church. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. the leaders of the church from the most important to the least important i.e. from the Pope, cardinals, bishops, parish priests etc. 1
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. as above and with the recognition that many were not devout, committed abuses such as absenteeism, simony etc. 2-3

- (b) Explain why the Catholic Church was slow to summon the Council of Trent. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. it was reluctant to consider reform, it was difficult to decide on a venue. 1-2
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. rivalry between Charles V and the French (Habsburg-Valois wars) made decisions about a venue difficult, decisions about practicalities such as voting rights, membership etc., a general council could overrule the Pope etc. 3-5
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. the most important issue was the effects of the rivalry between HRE and France because of their long term enmity and the power each had, and/or the fear of the Pope that he would be made to reform the Church and lose authority. 6-7

- (c) “The Council of Trent was more important in promoting the power of the Pope than in reforming the Catholic Church.”
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
Or
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

The Council did promote the power of the Pope, for example it confirmed the pope as the real head of the Church – he called the Council, chaired it, made its decrees official, purged the Curia, presided over internal reforms and clarifications of doctrine which enhanced his status.

The Council did, however, result in reform in the provinces of the Church – even in Spain where papal power was traditionally resisted e.g. reformed clergy did reside more in their sees, were more knowledgeable as a result of the work of the seminaries, became more devout through the moves to end abuses and more proficient in the liturgy, the numbers of effectively trained priests grew, new orders reinvigorated monastic life and brought some of the committed out into the community, e.g. the Ursulines. Catholics had a clearer identity and new guidelines about how their lives should be lived.

However, successful reform, e.g. in Spain was limited by the will of the rulers. In much of Europe it was also limited by other factors such as the growth of Protestantism. Much of its work had to be supported by secular princes to be successful. Some observers have also commented that the influence of the Jesuits was more important than that of the Pope.

Alternative B: Europe in Transition, c1470–1610

A2 Unit 4: The State, Authority and Conflict

Question 1

- (a) Use **Sources B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

How fully does **Source C** support the view in **Source B** of the extent of royal control over the Church in Spain in the sixteenth century? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Identifies/extracts simple statements from the sources which demonstrate agreement/disagreement on the issue. 1-2
- L2: Demonstrates explicit understanding of utility/sufficiency etc. with reference to the sources and knowledge of the issue. 3-5
- L3: Draws conclusions about utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue, with reference to both sources and to own knowledge. 6-8
- L4: Uses material selected appropriately from both source and own knowledge to reach a sustained judgement on utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue. 9-10

Indicative content

Answers at Level 1 could identify the view in Source B which suggests that the monarchy was all-powerful in relation to the Church, whereas Source C suggests that the influence of the Papacy through Trent was paramount. Answers at Level 2 could make the comparison more explicit and detailed, e.g. Source B suggests that the King's authority was greater than any papal court, whereas Source C suggests that the authority of the bishops was strengthened. Own knowledge might be used to confirm these arguments, e.g. the decrees of the Council of Trent had to be formally accepted by Philip II before they could be applied in Spain and only then Philip did create new bishops who used their authority to begin reform in line with Trent as in Source C. Answers which show understanding of the implications of the frequent friction which occurred between, e.g. Philip II and popes regarding matters such as clerical appointments, papal bulls, financial issues etc. and link this to Source B's assertion of the weakness of the papal challenge to the Spanish crown will be providing adequate criticism of the extent to which Source C can support Source B and should be considered for Level 3. At Level 4, answers should be seeking to reach a judgement on 'how fully', e.g. by building on Level 3 the understanding that there is fundamental agreement that royal control was paramount – Source C mentions "Spanish Catholicism". Some answers may reach differing conclusions if relating to Charles I rather than Philip II.

- (b) Use **Sources A, B, C and D** and your own knowledge.

“The decline of papal authority over the Spanish Church was more evident in organisational matters than in religious issues.”

To what extent do you agree with this view in relation to the years 1469 to 1598?

(20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **1-6**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative content

This is a synoptic question and candidates' responses should be rewarded for referring to aspects of change and continuity over a period of at least 100 years, as detailed in the specification for this particular Alternative, and to an appropriate range of factors as exemplified by the indicative content for each particular question.

Answers will need to identify aspects of the decline in papal authority in Spain in relation to both organisational issues/power and control and in relation to matters of faith and belief and also draw comparisons between them at differing points throughout the period to assess change and continuity and make judgements about relative change. Sophisticated responses could recognise a grey area in relation to religious issues, e.g. changes in the authority of bishops could be identified in relation to the way they were appointed/who they were appointed by (administrative) and in relation to their ability to disseminate matters of faith and belief (religion). Most answers will consider their material in the context of the reigns of

Ferdinand and Isabella, Charles I and Philip II as points of references. Good answers will make comparisons and contrasts between the reigns in terms of both issues. Answers along these lines should be considered for the award of Level 3 and above.

From the sources – Source A shows a monarchy (under Ferdinand) which began a process of control in administrative matters (appointment of bishops, taxation) and this was continued into the reigns of Charles I and Philip II (Source B). Source C suggests that Popes were still influential in matters of belief in the latter half of the century (the liturgy, Missal and Breviary) and Source D suggests that the king's support was necessary to both administrative matters (Moorish uprisings) and religious issues (honouring saints) in the reign of Philip II. Own knowledge should suggest that these two aspects were the key points of conflict over the period and that there was some overlap and interaction, e.g. Cisneros depended on the support of Ferdinand and Isabella to reform the religious orders (a religious issue) rather than on the support or intervention of the papacy; although the decrees of Trent could revolutionise Spanish Catholicism this could only happen if the administrative issues functioned effectively and the king accepted the need for change and reform. Much depended on the piety of the monarchs, their political circumstances and the influence of external affairs.

Level 1 answers will cover a limited timescale only or offer a very superficial view of change. Level 2 responses should demonstrate understanding of the main aspects of change over time although this may not cover both aspects (administrative and religious issues) equally. Level 3 understanding will be rooted in greater depth and consistency in dealing with both administrative and religious issues. Level 4 candidates may be more adept at treating the period as a whole rather than reign by reign and identifying change in relation to the issues, presenting a coherent overview of continuity and change. Level 5 responses will be thoroughly analytical and draw sound conclusions based on a representative choice of supporting material.

Section B

Question 2 onward

These questions are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of candidates' responses should be clearly linked to the range of factors or issues covered in the question as indicated by the generic A2 levels of response mark scheme and by the indicative content in the specific mark scheme for each question.

Standard Mark Scheme for Essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: *Either*

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis, but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such responses will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

1-6

L2: *Either*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, implicit understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **7-11**

L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Option A: The Netherlands, 1565-1609**Question 2**

“Circumstances, rather than any grand plan, dictated William of Orange’s actions in the Revolt of the Netherlands, 1565–1584.”

To what extent do you agree with this view? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Answers should assess the extent to which William of Orange simply dealt with crises and problems as they arose rather than planning to subvert Spanish rule and initiating rebellion. Some might make reference to the debate between historians such as Motley (William as the architect) and Geyl (William as a product, not an initiator of revolt) and latterly Swart and Israel.

Consideration of ‘circumstances’ might refer to his opposition to the bishoprics scheme, although this is before the start of the specified period; if so, credit should be given if it is linked, e.g. William used his influence to have Granvelle dismissed but was alarmed at the growth of heresy and the iconoclast riots which followed and helped Margaret of Parma

restore order. William always maintained that he was opposing Spain to restore traditional rights and not out of disloyalty. Later he was antagonised by the actions of Alva and the imposition of the Tenth Penny; Alva's reaction to this, declaring Orange an outlaw might be said to have driven William into opposition. William then renounced allegiance to Philip II and began to look for support from England and France for action against Alva. However, Philip's bankrupt state and mutinying troops were also part of the decision and the resultant Pacification of Ghent 1576 did recognise the continuing authority of Spain as well as accepting William as Stadholder of Holland and Zeeland. By 1580, William had been declared an outlaw and therefore had no choice but to oppose Spain.

Once William assumed a high profile, the struggle for overt leadership became stronger and he signed the Union of Utrecht, which formalised opposition to Spain. Parma's successful campaign 1579–1584 to attempt to subvert this also confirmed William's military leadership. However, he had been cultivating contacts as early as 1572, with German princes, Elizabeth I and the Huguenots seeking a political leader for the North; an indication of espousal of the cause. By 1577, although Archduke Mathias was ostensibly in power, it was William who exercised this. Subsequently he campaigned to have himself accepted as sovereign but was assassinated before anything came of it. The very fact that William had fought and campaigned against Spanish authority for such a period of time would suggest an overarching plan if not a detailed strategy.

Question 3

“Political issues far outweighed religious differences in explaining the outbreak of revolt in the Netherlands by 1572.”

To what extent do you agree with this view?

(20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Answers could consider the importance of a range of political issues stimulating revolt, e.g. resentment against Philip II as a Spaniard and a Castilian who seemed to have little sympathy with the situation in the Netherlands; the inexperience of Margaret of Parma who probably over-emphasised the danger of the situation in 1566; the limited role played by the local nobility in government who disliked the Spanish, and the dominance of Granvelle; the sidelining of Orange who was rich and influential; resentment at the new bishopric scheme because it excluded the nobility and cut them out of significant patronage and power; the emergence of the Council of State as the main source power; the execution of Egmont and Hoorne; Alva's 'reign of terror'; opposition to the Tenth Penny and other taxes; the work of the Council of Troubles.

Religious issues could be identified as e.g. the fear of the threat of the introduction of the Inquisition into the Netherlands which had always had a slightly unorthodox approach to religion; the division of the existing 4 bishoprics into 18 and the exclusion of sons of the nobility from office – Granvelle was seen as the author of this and therefore the scheme was

linked to Spanish domination; the fear that matters would develop further, possibly leading to the introduction of the Inquisition – this was a product of/symptomatic of the view held of Philip II as intolerant and authoritarian particularly when heresy began to be equated with treason; he was not prepared to listen to differing views.

Set in context, good answers will show understanding of the connections between the two elements – and that for contemporaries, this was significant. However, Alva's policies might be perceived to be the fundamental weakness at the centre of this; they alienated Catholics as well as those drawn to the reformed faith; e.g. he disturbed political as well as religious sensitivities through discrimination against Netherlanders, e.g. in preferring to appoint Italians and Spaniards to high profile posts and excluding experienced administrators from the region.

Question 4

“Political rather than religious issues hindered the establishment of the Dutch Republic before 1590.”

How far do you agree with this statement? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Political: before 1590 the United Provinces were a collection of states under the leadership of Spanish appointed rulers – Margaret of Parma, Alva etc. As early as 1579, however, the northern states had formed the Union of Utrecht and the southern states the Union of Arras. Neither side wanted a division and conflict continued. At one stage there were three different groupings; the south under Philip II and Catholicism, the centre gave allegiance to the States – General and had not clarified the religious situation and the north which had established Calvinism was more overtly seeking independence. The campaigns of Parma kept the situation fluid. There was no clear management of the north and despite its religious affiliations it drew in the Duke of Anjou to become the political head, and the intervention of Elizabeth I of England who saw links with the Netherlands as a way of staving off a Spanish attack on England. By 1590, however, the north was declared ‘self-governing’ through the States-General, a ‘sovereign institution’, although the Spanish campaigns continued.

Religious affairs – the religious struggle was more clear-cut; the Union of Utrecht imposed 1579 Calvinist worship in the North; no right to practise Catholicism was granted but Catholics were still in the majority. As protestant groups moved from the south, however, and the political division became clearer, the balance began to shift. However, there were still disputes within Protestantism, e.g. between Lutherans and Arminians, over predestination and free will.

The success of the revolt will need to be established in terms of its causation; the Dutch Republic had been established in 1590 and a constitution drawn up; Oldenbarneveldt became its political leader; it had its own representative body although this was often slowed down by the need to refer back to the electors. It was free in terms of religion but in practice

disputes once again emerged; this time between Calvinists and Arminians. The Dutch had not specifically aimed at complete independence from Spain but the impetus had grown with the Spanish reaction and other events in Europe.

Option B: Charles V and the Holy Roman Empire, 1519–1556

Question 5

To what extent was Charles V limited by political and financial issues in seeking to assert his authority in the Holy Roman Empire? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Political – although there was a general desire theoretically for a strong united Germany, in practice there was no real will; no-one wanted to lose in the process, particularly the princes. This was illustrated in the Capitulation agreed in 1519 between Charles and the princes; Charles had to promise constitutional reforms as a condition of support in the imperial election. The princes often actively sought power, e.g. in 1521 at Worms they demanded the right to appoint 18 out of 22 councillors on the Regency Council. The empire was divided into 400+ units and this made central control very difficult. When there was conflict as in the Knights War and the Peasants War it was often dealt with by the local princes who were in situ, rather than by Charles or Ferdinand. The problem of the succession and the quarrels/rivalry between Charles and Ferdinand made it easier for divisions to arise. There were, however, some occasions when Charles V did assert his authority, e.g. he abolished the Regency Council in 1530; in 1547 his victory at Muhlberg gave him temporary dominance and at the 1548 Interim of Augsburg, he was able to strengthen the Supreme Court and set up a Regency Council without the princes. Largely, however, his absences militated against success.

Finances – initially this might be seen as a strength; Charles won the election to Holy Roman Emperor largely through bribes to electors, borrowed from Fuggers (his credit was good because of his income from the Spanish Americas); he was also able to borrow to finance Muhlberg, but eventually could not sustain this large debt. Money also played a part in the princes discontent regarding the Catholic Church; they resented papal taxation and believed that they paid more than other countries. Charles V was unwilling to tackle these issues with the Pope because of his own strong beliefs; he had limited leverage with popes in any case to make them deal with corruption. There were also linked economic issues which meant the finances of princes were unstable, e.g. the shift in trade from N European ports to the Atlantic. These issues generated further dissatisfaction with Charles V's government. Meanwhile conflict in Italy, against the Turks and inflation in Spain meant there was little available for Charles to spend in Holy Roman Empire.

Consequently, answers might favour either of these issues as the most important, e.g. finances may be regarded as a root cause of political difficulties – had Charles been able to

sustain the level of investment in the princes of the earlier years there may have been more limited opposition; alternatively, the divisive nature of the empire was traditional and unlikely to change in the face of challenges such as Lutheranism.

Question 6

“The Ottoman Turks were a greater threat than the German princes to the stability of the Holy Roman Empire in the reign of Charles V.”

To what extent do you agree with this view?

(20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Undoubtedly both groups posed a potential/substantial/continuous threat to the Holy Roman Empire. One group alone may have been dealt with but the combination of the two was more serious. Both presented religious, political and military threats – the Ottomans as external enemies who succeeded in invading, albeit temporarily, and the princes as a competing force within the empire.

Charles probably saw the Ottoman threat on land as less serious; it was not a direct threat to his position internationally (even the loss of Hungary); he never spent as much money or time on it; he never acceded to papal requests to head a ‘crusade’ against the Turks; he resisted his brother’s pleas for military help perhaps in view of the limitations of the Ottoman army’s seasonal campaigning. The greatest danger lay in the alliance with France (it threatened achievements in Italy forced him to spend on his army and made him appear weak as Holy Roman Emperor). Even this was limited by the reaction of other European powers to the infiltration of the Ottoman Empire into Europe. Charles did have successes, e.g. the capture of Tunis 1535; the over-wintering of the Turkish fleet in Toulon in 1538 alarmed Europe; Francis I was seen as an enemy to Christendom.

The German princes were a two-fold threat – politically and as Lutherans. Political ambitions presented a great threat, e.g. as evident at the time of Charles’s election when he had to spend huge sums in bribes to the Electors, the Capitulation in which he had to promise reform (confirmed on his election) and the mobilisation of an army to deal with the Swabian League. Of these the greatest threat was the Capitulation, published on his election, confirming his support for princely rights and a reform programme; negotiations toned this down, e.g. the Regency Council operate in only in Charles’s absence and only until the next Diet when it would be reviewed. The power of the Council was never exercised; under Ferdinand it became an obedient body and virtually non-existent after 1529. The more decisive threat from influential princes was their willingness to use force to support their religious views and the divisive effect on, e.g. the Leagues and Diets, aided by diversions provided by the Turks.

Answers could consider other factors to reach a conclusion, e.g. Charles’s absence from the empire in the early years was more important than any of the proposed factor – Ferdinand was unable to take decisive action; Charles tended to respond to a problem rather than

anticipate and pre-empt it; by 1529 it was too late to impose effective stability on the empire; whilst an external threat like that of the Ottoman Empire could take advantage and make it worse, it does not form as continuous a threat as internal enemies like the princes continually jostling for position.

Question 7

“The Holy Roman Empire was stronger in political and religious terms at the end of the reign of Charles V than it had been in the early years of the reign.”

How far do you agree with this statement?

(20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Before 1525: in political terms, the Holy Roman Empire was divided by differing territories and the terms under which they were governed, e.g. the princely lands, those held by Imperial Knights and self-governing towns. There were tensions within states, e.g. as rulers built up their power, established bureaucracies etc. and between states, e.g. the Austrian Habsburg lands and the Burundian lands. Although Maximilian had attempted to impose some common structures, e.g. the Common Penny tax, an imperial court and administration, they were not successful because of princely opposition. However, the demands placed upon Charles V in the Capitulation as a condition for his election demonstrated some signs of unity of action, although squabbles still continued, e.g. the Knights' War. In religious terms, there was an adherence to Catholicism as a common faith but this was being undermined by the emergence of Luther and the support of Imperial Knights. The Diet of Worms had outlawed Luther but there was little sign of the issue dying. Further turmoil resulted from the Peasants' War which had some religious roots.

By 1555: the Holy Roman Empire may well be regarded as even weaker in political and religious terms; answers may point to achievements by 1529 when Lutherans (divided amongst themselves) were weak, Charles had been successful in Italy etc. Following this, however, conflict with Lutheran princes was renewed leading to the Schmalkaldic League being formed and a war fought which continued into the 1550s; the result was failure for Charles V personally in recognising the existence of two religions in 1555, adherence to which depended, not on the Holy Roman Empire but on individual princes. However, this arrangement did bring a temporary end to the internal wars. In the latter years of Charles's reign the issue of the succession also became difficult, with a quarrel between Charles and his brother Ferdinand, resulting ultimately in division of territories: the Holy Roman Empire to the Austrian branch of the family and Spain to the Spanish branch. The inclusion of the Netherlands in the Spanish dominions was to lead eventually to rebellion lasting until 1609.

Option C: Suleiman the Magnificent, 1520–1566**Question 8**

To what extent did Suleiman seek to establish his authority within the Ottoman Empire through peaceful rather than repressive methods? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Peaceful methods might be identified as: public shows of ‘magnificence’ which showed Suleiman as a person above all others, e.g. through elaborate court ceremonies, jewelled robes, protocol, the encouragement of cultural development through support and publicity for poets, scholars etc. The growth of government through law (Suleiman was known as ‘the lawgiver’), applied to all without regard to religion – most new laws were related to justice (criminal law), finance (taxes); regulations were enforced and high standards of administration expected: he supported and justified the canonical law (shariat); other religions and cultures were tolerated within the empire as long as the relevant dues and taxes were paid (e.g. many Jews settled in the Ottoman Empire at this time); the building of an infrastructure across a range of activities, e.g. roads, bridges, palaces; the legal system, the timar system and the role of the sipahi; the settling of landless peoples: the adoption of the title of ‘Caliph’ or ‘supreme leader of the Islamic community: the settlement of the succession before his death (although this was done by judicial murder): he toured the country frequently to get to know his people and ‘relieve their distress’.

However, there were occasions when repressive measures were used, e.g. janissary garrisons were maintained in all strategic towns as a measure of control: he controlled the succession, e.g. his son Mustafa was killed (possibly organised by his own mother) as he was deemed unsuitable to succeed to the throne; he also ordered the execution of another son, Bayezid, who tried to compete to become the heir: he promulgated the concept of ‘holy war’ to give rights over territory conquered as well as justifying the pursuit of war; he used the Muslim law (shariat) to punish offenders – disobedience to the Sultan was also disobedience to God: he did not hesitate to remove his opponents, e.g. Ibrahim Pasha.

Answers should weigh the evidence to arrive at a conclusion. Much evidence is considered to have come from Suleiman himself and he was therefore the author of his own image.

Question 9

Why, despite its military and naval strengths, did the Ottoman empire fail to resolve the conflict with the western powers in the Mediterranean? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Conflict between Ottoman Empire and Western Europe had been in existence intermittently since the crusades; the Ottoman Empire in 16th century was probably militarily stronger than any individual European state, but even the fall of Constantinople in 1453 had not seemed to encourage organised resistance to it. Although there was some conflict in central Europe, e.g. the Ottoman attacks on Hungary and Vienna in 1529, the more persistent and serious conflict was in and around the Mediterranean.

Some factors explaining this might be: the disunity of the western powers – there was no enthusiasm for the traditional concept of crusading as in medieval period; the Habsburg-Valois struggle between France and the Holy Roman Empire absorbed energies and continued until 1559 – Popes did try to get promises of crusades from France and the Holy Roman Empire when peace treaties were made, but nothing happened in real terms. During that conflict any lengthy concerted action against the Ottoman Empire would only have been a distraction and difficult in view of the political and territorial differences between them – the only example was in 1570 before Lepanto. In fact, the French saw alliance with Ottoman Empire against the Holy Roman Empire as a reasonable tactic. Charles V was not always on good terms with the Pope, particularly before 1534. Other internal problems diverted European nations, e.g. France and Wars of Religion, Spain and the Revolt of the Netherlands, Holy Roman Empire and princes and Protestants. Western armies were often, although not always, mercenaries or not reliable/committed to a cause, e.g. Spanish armies in Netherlands mutinied frequently because of the lack of pay/food and the poor conditions etc. Occasional individual attacks occurred, e.g. after 1540 and a truce between Habsburg and Valois, Charles V did attack Algiers but failed.

The strengths of the Ottoman Empire: Ottoman Turks had loyalty to both their religion and to the Sultan and were therefore a more united fighting force; those who were part of the *devshirme* (janissaries and sipahis) were well disciplined (as testified by de Busbecq) although their weapons and armour were sometimes inferior to the west; these groups could if they chose influence the course of a campaign: the Ottoman Empire alliance with France gave access further into the Mediterranean and a base in Toulon in 1537/8; Suleiman gave Barbarossa his support and constructed a new fleet based in Algiers. By 1540, Venice had surrendered territories giving Turks a base in the East Mediterranean; after the battle of Prevesa 1538 until Lepanto in 1571, the Turks dominated the Mediterranean. However, several significant failures weakened the Ottoman attack, e.g. to take Malta in 1565, and the diversion of war with Iran after 1547, meant that the Turks became less successful.

Question 10

How far is it appropriate to describe the Ottoman empire, in the years 1520 to 1566, as a state united in both political and religious matters? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

In terms of politics: there were no political parties/factions; the Sultan relied heavily on the loyalty of the Janissaries who could deal with internal insurrection as well as war. The legal system provided a framework to cover all aspects of life, e.g. taxes, property, crime etc. This was delivered via the Grand Vizier who was the most powerful person, after the Sultan, creating a centralised system. The Grand Vizier could be removed by the will of the Sultan as happened to Ibrahim Pasha. The Sultan also worked with the Divan which acted as an Imperial Council, but would intervene in events personally if required. There was no aristocracy to threaten his authority; promotion was by merit. Challenges were dealt with swiftly and usually permanently, e.g. Suleiman's son Mustafa was murdered 1553 because he was thought to be plotting against Suleiman.

In terms of religion: the religion of the state was Islam enforced by Sharia law; Suleiman was the Protector of Islam and the government defended and extended the boundaries as it saw fit. The Ulema, a group of learned men, provided the scholars, lawyers etc for the state who interpreted, taught and enforced the religious law. The Sheriat law was based on religion but there was also Kanun law based on principles of governing and administrative law. Kanun law could change at the will of the Sultan but Sheriat law was fixed. Kanun law took the form of decrees on topics, related to specific regions of the empire etc. When new territories were conquered, the law of the area was studied and preserved where possible, so unrest was prevented where possible, e.g. in Iraq in 1537. Other religions were tolerated, e.g. Judaism, Greek Orthodox etc. Followers of other religions were controlled by the millet system and could never gain advancement, e.g. in the army. As in any state, there were small groups of extremists. Education was based on the study of Moslem theology and of the Sheriat law.

Some answers might compare the Ottoman Empire with western states; this should not dominate the answer. The evidence suggests a tightly controlled state but one willing to make compromises if necessary for political/economic/military survival, provided that this did not prejudice the core systems and values of the community.

Alternative B: Europe in Transition, c1470–1610

A2 Unit 6: Henry IV of France: A Modern King?

Question 1

- (a) Use **Source B** and your own knowledge.

How valid is the interpretation in **Source B** of the relationship between Henry IV and the Huguenots? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Summarises the content of the extract and the interpretation it contains. 1-2
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the interpretation and relates to own knowledge. 3-5
- L3: As L2, and evaluation of the interpretation is partial. 6-8
- L4: Understands and evaluates the interpretation and relates to own knowledge to reach a sustained and well supported judgement on its validity. 9-10

Indicative content

Level 1 responses will relate to the content of the source only e.g. that the author contends that Henry IV wished for the Huguenots to become Catholic but hoped this could happen without pressure being put upon them. Level 2 answers will extend this to include material from own knowledge, e.g. many Huguenots initially were prepared to support him, but their legal position was difficult as there were still edicts proscribing them. His abjuration had offended them and at Mantes they demanded concessions and began to build up their position in the provinces. The threat of open conflict became serious. At Level 3, answers should begin to explain and evaluate the interpretation, e.g. much was at stake for Henry IV to prove his credentials to the majority of the population, his erstwhile opponents and to the Catholic Church. He also had the tradition of ‘one faith’ etc. to uphold and the Church hierarchy to appease. However, he was politician enough to realise that, against the background of the civil war, there was a need to establish some consensus without antagonising either Catholics or Huguenots completely. This led to the compromise of Edict of Nantes which restricted their activities e.g. in terms of worship, but also to his willingness to, e.g. involve Huguenots such as Sully in government. For Level 4, look for some extension to this discussion and a conclusion, e.g. Henry’s concern is valid; the Edict of Nantes imposed some quite heavy restrictions upon the Huguenots – many remained on the fringes of society, although a small number had influence at court – notably Sully. However, the interpretation may seem to lack validity. Henry used, for example, fears that Jesuits might return, and that the decrees of the Council of Trent would be accepted etc. to keep the Huguenots under control. Many Huguenots felt that Henry had converted for political reasons, so he was not a true Catholic. Therefore, they continued to support him.

-
- (b) Use **Source A** and your own knowledge.

How useful is **Source A** as evidence of the problems faced by Henry IV with the Catholic Church?
(10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Summarises the content of the extract in relation to the issue presented in the question. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates some appreciation either of the strengths and/or of the limitations of the content of the source in relation to its utility/reliability within the context of the issue. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates reasoned understanding of the strengths and limitations of the source in the context of the issue and draws conclusions about its utility/reliability. **6-8**
- L4: Evaluates the utility/reliability of the source in relation to the issue in the question to reach a sustained and well supported judgement. **9-10**

Indicative content

At Level 1 answers may extract information from the source which indicates that there was a crisis in the church because of a shortage of Catholic personnel, and will know from their own knowledge that many sees were vacant. In addition there was natural distrust of Henry by the Pope and he (the Pope) was not always willing to accept Henry's nominations. By Level 2 candidates may assess utility by placing this issue in the context of a larger problem e.g. the quality of the clergy in the reign of Henry III had been poor and the Pope had obstructed some of his appointments, therefore the problem was not new; criticism was wrongly directed solely at Henry IV. For Level 3, candidates should show some awareness of the level of propaganda exercised by both sides in the dispute, direct evidence of appointments is not always available because many were made by granting the right to a supporter or a member of an important/powerful family (as a way of gaining support for Henry IV). They should also be aware that granting sees was sometimes in the hands of the major nobility, whether Henry IV agreed with them or not. In addition, e.g. when the Pope sent Cardinal Medici to investigate the episcopal problem he declared many of them to be worthy and well qualified. Knowledge of the situation at the end of the reign may also have some bearing. Relations with the Pope improved over time. For Level 4, answers should reflect a range of arguments for and against utility, e.g. showing awareness that much of the evidence base is Henry's own propaganda and his assertions that he had reorganised the clergy contrasted against the practical problems generated by war and religious conflict.

- (c) Use **Sources A, B, C and D** and your own knowledge.

“Henry IV was successful in establishing religious peace and unity in France.”

Assess the validity of this opinion.

(20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative. **1-6**

- L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**

- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative content

Although peace might depend on unity and vice versa, good answers should also differentiate. Peace might be interpreted as being between the Church and state in France, or between France and Rome; unity could refer to agreement on religious belief and/or practice.

From the sources – Source A indicates that there was still some conflict with Rome and Henry IV was not entirely trusted (possibly because of his recent Protestant past and oscillation between the two faiths). His absolution was partly dependent on the fact that he would not appoint any more Protestants in future. Source B indicates that Henry was prepared to reward those who abjured the Huguenot faith but did not want to force his people to do this; this could have prevented the renewal of civil war in his reign. It makes reference to the ‘single Gallican church’. Source C indicates that Henry protected Gallican independence by not entirely accepting the Tridentine decrees, was not interested in the Inquisition but did accept the Jesuits because they were teachers rather than enforcers, although there may have been other indirect influences on this decision. However, Source D indicates that a Huguenot population still remained in France; the circumstances suggest they

were not likely to renounce their faith. Peace therefore might exist but unity was not complete. Edicts do not change minds.

From own knowledge: peace appears to have been the priority in that, for example, Henry IV had clearly defeated the League but was not vindictive, working with, for example, Jeannin (who became a member of the Privy Council, was trusted with diplomatic missions). Jeannin drew into his clientage networks those Protestants who were willing to recognise his authority. Prominent Huguenots like Sully worked in government and were not required to change faith. There was no French inquisition. Holt points out that there was some hardening of the confessional issue in the cities where it was easier to create the space to keep Protestants and Catholics apart but there was little evidence of, e.g. harassment, sacking of churches, extensive prosecutions for heresy etc. This limited conflict is confirmed to a degree by Knecht who quotes instances of increasing tension, e.g. the objections of Parlement to the Edict of Nantes, missions by friars to Huguenot areas in attempts to convert; Baumgartner also comments on continued plots on the life of Henry IV. Rady indicates that although the Edict of Nantes gave the Huguenots complete freedom of worship this was restricted, e.g. to the places they had worshipped publicly in 1597.

In conclusion, answers could suggest that tensions did exist but were controlled by the strong personality of the King and the need for a period of peace after the wars of religion. Knecht sets the period, in relation to the rest of Europe, as a ‘honeymoon’ period before the outbreak of the Thirty Years War. Therefore success was limited and transient but significant in providing respite from internal strife.

NB: The question is about **religious** unity and peace and not unity and peace in general. Answers should therefore be directed to this focus; if a broader focus is adopted then this will have an impact on the overall quality of the answer and it is possible that the top levels (4 and 5) may not be accessed.