



General Certificate of Education

AS History 1041

Unit 2: HIS2C

The Reign of Henry IV of France, 1589–1610

Mark Scheme

2010 examination – January 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.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2010 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which candidates meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a candidate performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

January 2010

GCE AS History Unit 2: Historical Issues: Periods of Change

HIS2C: The Reign of Henry IV of France, 1589–1610

Question 1

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

Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to Henry IV's restoration of royal authority. (12 marks)

Target: AO2(a)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will **either** briefly paraphrase/describe the content of the two sources **or** identify simple comparison(s) between the sources. Skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources and identify some differences and/or similarities. There may be some limited own knowledge. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed. **3-6**
- L3:** Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences **and** similarities and using own knowledge to explain and evaluate these. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed. **7-9**
- L4** Responses will make a developed comparison between the views expressed in the two sources and will apply own knowledge to evaluate and to demonstrate a good contextual understanding. Answers will, for the most part, show good skills of written communication. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates will need to identify differences between the views of the two sources, for example:

- Source A suggests that winning the support of the capital would be important, whereas Source B indicates that the placing of royal officers in specific parts of France would be useful in restoring royal authority
- Source B emphasises the element of bribery in terms of the opposition by rewarding those members of the League who were willing to negotiate, e.g. Brissac, and this is confirmed in Source B

-
- Source A states that most of the major League towns were willing to accept Henry's authority, whereas Source B quite clearly refutes this to some degree by stating that 'Royal directives were sometimes ignored'.

Candidates will need to apply their own knowledge of context to explain these differences. They might for example refer to:

- the differing timescale in which each source is placed suggests different tactics could be used at different times, e.g. once Henry had got the support of the capital in 1594, he would be able to extend his authority beyond that to League towns; own knowledge would suggest that his conversion in 1593 would have been an important enabling factor
- Henry's recognition that he had to work at improving support for his bid for the throne which led to bribery of a number of those who held out against him, e.g. 900,000 ecus to the Duke of Lorraine as well as to Marshal de Brissac in Paris, as quoted in Source B. This had shown that some religious alignments were only 'skin deep' and the motivation for his supporters was political
- the issues of religion and politics which were closely entwined in 16th Century France as a result of the previous Wars of Religion; Henry knew that it was too soon to expect the States-General to accept him and therefore proceeded to govern by Edict, including the Edict of Nantes. This broke through the impasse. His earlier decision also to publish the decrees of the Council of Trent was strategic.

To address 'how far' answers should also indicate some similarity between the sources, for example:

- both sources suggest that he was determined to restore the authority of the crown, e.g. Source A identifies his need to 'win over Paris' and Source B suggests that Henry realised that he had 'to tread cautiously'
- both sources comment on his tactics as being low key, e.g. 'at first he had to tread cautiously' Source B and the use of 'the carrot rather than the stick' and 'playing on increasing popular support' Source A.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, candidates may conclude that both sources emphasise the importance of the town for Henry. However, Source A suggests Henry IV had succeeded by 1594 in restoring the authority to the crown; Source B is more balanced in appraisal, aware that Henry did not always gain instant approval although the fact that he was legally king generated some support. Both sources, however, acknowledge some degree of success.

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

How important were the towns for Henry IV in achieving control of France? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(b), AO2(a), AO2(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

- L1:** Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may comprise an undeveloped mixture of the two. They may contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may contain a mixture of the two. They may be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the focus of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question using evidence from **both** the sources **and** own knowledge. They will provide some assessment backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels mark scheme.

In 'How important' questions, candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points supporting importance against others which do not. The answer could be exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Relevant material from the sources would include:

- Source A makes reference to 'winning the loyalty' and support of the capital. Links are made to the appearance of placards supporting Henry. The source also tells us that various Leaguer towns had submitted to the king by 1594, suggesting that this was significant. It is important to note, however, that they may not have done so without his abjuration
- Source B takes this further by explaining Henry's positive actions to bring some towns into his jurisdiction, e.g. by granting and confirming privileges, with some suggestions that such privileges be extended. However, the source also notes that, by 1595, when Henry had been recognised as king, he is less benevolent; mayors are replaced by more pliant men, although this, in turn, caused difficulties and resentment amongst the townspeople grew. The reference to delaying tactics when taxes like the *pancarte* were due, is an example of this. Thus, it seems, that the towns were important but in a more negative than a positive sense
- Source C considers factors other than towns, stating that 'subtle increases' in royal authority such as the careful placement of tax officers and the use of '*chambres de justice*' were better markers of Henry's restoration of royal power.

From their own knowledge:

Factors suggesting the towns were important for Henry IV in achieving control of France by 1600, might include:

- Paris clearly was a very important city as the seat of monarchy; this makes Baumgartner's comment that 'A Protestant king could never hope to rule France from Paris' significant. However, in 1594, Henry negotiated with the Governor of Paris to surrender the city for a payment of 1.4 million livres. Members of the League were generally given an amnesty and some asked for and were given pardons. Henry IV, however, was not safe in Paris, and attempts were made to assassinate him
- another important city was Amiens, but this was not taken until 1598
- once Henry had abjured in 1593, other towns declared their loyalty but it came at a price, e.g. he remitted the *taille* tax, Protestants were to be excluded from worshipping in the town, arrears of taxes were to be overlooked etc. Sully is said to have spent 30-32 million livres to seal these agreements
- Henry's coronation in 1594 resulted in further capitulations from League towns such as Amiens, Bourges, Reims, Rouen and Troyes. Henry was prepared to be lenient with them e.g. he cleared a town's debts or agreed to a taxation 'holiday'.

Factors suggesting that towns were not important in achieving control in France might include:

- Henry had defeated the forces of the League by 1600, and its members began to accept Henry as king
- Henry's coronation in 1594 resulted in further capitulations from significant League towns such as Amiens, Bourges, Reims, Rouen, and Troyes
- Henry was prepared to be lenient with those towns which were willing to surrender and also reward those individuals, such as the Duke of Mayenne who also surrendered. In some instances, he cleared a town's debts, or agreed to a taxation 'holiday'
- Henry's own personality and behaviour were also significant, e.g. Spanish troops which had occupied Paris were allowed to leave unmolested, although those which remained in Burgundy were vigorously defeated in battle. However, it did take him until 1598 to conclude a peace treaty, the Peace of Vervins, and there were occasional 'differences' between the French and Spanish for some time after this

- in 1599, the Edict of Nantes was registered by the Parlement of Paris. Although other parlements were not so quick to follow suit, the edict was an important marker which brought a degree of acceptance of the religious settlement
- the work of Sully which, through improvements to finance and the economy, enabled some return to normality.

Good answers may conclude that the significance of Paris was high because of its size, number of inhabitants and, most importantly, its role as the centre of government, but that other cities were also significant because of their potential to form opposition to the crown, e.g. those at a distance from Paris might be more able to sustain opposition over a longer period and require money and troops to subdue them.

Question 2

- (a) Explain why Henry IV issued the Edict of Nantes in 1598. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic mark scheme

The answer to this question could focus on the following factors:

- one of the most important reasons for the issue of the Edict of Nantes was unity. This was a significant motivator; 'one king, one faith, one law' was an important part of the French psyche; France had been a Catholic country with a Catholic leader from very early medieval times
- the growth of antagonism to the wars from ordinary people who had had their lives torn apart, economically, socially and politically for 30 years was also important. Bands of armed men were gathering to protect themselves in the north, in Burgundy and the Limousin; this created issues of law and order as well as religion. There was evidence that some of these people were also subject to demands from the Catholic League for money and property
- the Huguenot assemblies of 1594, 1595, 1596 and 1597 began to demand guarantees for their future; some Protestants had stopped payment for the *taille*
- some of the Huguenot nobility were threatening to continue the civil wars if the king did not give them some concessions

- the defeat of renegade League nobles in 1598 also gave Henry the opportunity to make an effective settlement with the Huguenots.

Answers which are limited in range and descriptive should be placed at Level 1. More depth, coherence and some limited awareness of differing views should place the answer in Level 2. To reach the higher levels, candidates should develop a wide range of specific issues with linkages effectively made.

- (b) 'The Huguenot threat to religious unity during Henry IV's reign was limited.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels mark scheme.

Answers to this question should assess the strengths and weaknesses of the Huguenot movement in geographical, political and social contexts to reach a balanced conclusion about the extent of the threat which the Huguenots posed.

- Answers should show awareness that the Huguenot community in France was small in numbers although they played a vital role, e.g. in Henry IV's army in the 1590s. Evidence that the threat was limited can be seen, e.g. in the fact that Henry did not, when he became king, oust all the Catholic ministers and replace them with Huguenots;

he made Bouillon (who was later to make trouble) an envoy to Protestant territories outside France (Greengrass suggests this was to prevent him interfering in internal matters)

- Henry did not change any of the laws which restricted the political and religious freedoms of the Huguenots
- Henry did issue the letters patent of Mantes in 1591 which regranted some concessions which had been removed earlier, e.g. Huguenots could now worship in one place in each locality, on the estates of Huguenot gentlemen and in 8 garrison towns. However, these concessions never had the force of law and were generally ignored by Catholics
- there were no bipartisan courts to which Huguenots could appeal and their ministers had to be funded by their congregations and not by the state. Henry's conversion in 1593 was a blow to the Huguenots and led to a series of demands which he ignored.

Alternatively, however, it is possible to argue that the Huguenots were a threat to religious unity for example:

- if Henry IV chose not take notice of their concerns. Although they were clearly out of favour in the 1590s, the unwelcome possibility that they might join with Catholic dissidents was evident
- in addition, there was a threat to unity within the movement from Huguenot aristocrats, e.g. La Tremoille, Duke of Thours, who was briefly president of the Huguenot assembly dared to suggest that France needed a new leader. He even suggested that this leader should come from abroad. Bouillon was also involved in this proposal. Greengrass suggests that the Edict of Nantes would not have been so supportive of the Huguenots without this challenge to Henry's leadership. Evidence that Henry regarded Bouillon and Tremoille as a threat is confirmed by his consent to their marriage alliances
- even moderate Protestants had some concern about Henry's support for them and this raised the stakes. Huguenot assemblies grew in size and frequency and were in almost permanent session by 1598. However, the Edict of Nantes went a long way to restoring good relations through the granting of Huguenot worship in specific places, allowing offices to be taken up/inherited by Huguenots as well as Catholics and the creation of bipartisan chambers to judge cases involving Protestants (*Chambres de l'Edit*). The latter were slow to develop but often successful
- the Edict gave Huguenots some status through the *brevets*, e.g. to defend themselves through the appointment of garrisons of soldiers, although their captains had to be selected by the king
- the Huguenots had systems which would allow them to defend themselves against others. Their assemblies continued to meet, e.g. in 1601, appointing two protestant deputies to court so that they could raise problems easily and quickly with the king.

However, there were limitations, e.g. royal Catholic judges were always present at the *Chambres de l'Edit*, it was the law of the land which was imposed, Protestants still had to pay tithes, they remained a marginal religious group and Catholicism was the accepted faith of the land. Religious co-existence was, therefore, never meant to be permanent: the concessions were to secure peace. Henry said, 'Necessity led me to draft this Edict (Nantes)'.

Good answers will develop their arguments with effective supporting material and draw clear conclusions about the extent of the threat. Some effective answers may argue strongly for a particular view from the start and also demonstrate the weaknesses of the opposing view; others may build up their conclusions in a more balanced way. Both avenues could lead to a well directed analysis and strong evaluation and should be appropriately rewarded at the higher level.

Question 3

- (a) Explain why Henry IV promoted the reconstruction of Paris. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: this content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

- To some extent this development was part of the general rebuilding which took place in other cities at the end of the Wars of Religion, e.g. Lyons rebuilt itself as a centre of the silk industry; La Rochelle became an important naval base, Paris as the capital and a centre of conflict needed some redevelopment etc
- it was also a consequence of the revival of the economy and the work of Sully; as France became more peaceful, financiers, aristocrats and gentlemen saw the possibilities of regeneration
- it helped to oil the financial wheels and was also a means of advertising Paris as the centre of France and the success of Henry IV's rule. The most famous development is the Place des Vosges, designed like an Italian piazza
- the element of display was important as it demonstrated the king's authority. The Louvre, the Pont Neuf and the Place Dauphine are examples of this motive. However, the motive was more economic than 'show' but added to the city's development and improved surroundings, e.g. pavements were laid, water supplies improved and rubbish collected, although the latter was probably the least effective.

To reach the higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationships between the factors given and to demonstrate some discrimination between them in terms of their influence on the decision to expend large sums on rebuilding.

- (b) Sully's greatest achievement was to place France on a sound financial footing.
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: this content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Factors which support the fact that Sully placed France on a sure financial footing could be:

- Sully was a strong supporter of both monetary and economic reform in France. He believed that the two were connected and together could bring about a revival of French fortunes
- his role as *surintendant de finances* allowed him to stabilise the currency in 1602. Although not a popular move, it eased the situation for a time

-
- Sully also established indirect rather than direct, taxation, largely through tax farmers. Taxes such as the *gabelle* (salt tax) rose. A new tax, the *pancarte*, was a tax on all goods sold in markets in walled towns. It was set up as an emergency measure for 3 years but an attempt to renew it in 1601 led to riots in, e.g. Poitiers and Lomoges. The *pancarte* ended in 1602
 - Sully reviewed taxes and particularly tax abuse and the ways in which taxes were collected; existing officials were dismissed and new ones put in their place. He was aided in this by Giles de Maupeou, who was particularly successful in collecting taxes in Brittany. Sully also demanded that local treasurers were prompt in their duties and often sent demanding letters if they did not conform. Tax farmers were also supervised to prevent embezzlement; in one case more than 1 million livres was involved
 - expenditure and court expenses were drastically reduced. The biggest expense which remained was on the armies.

Additionally, however, Sully also placed France on a sound economic footing. This was important as it, in turn, impacted on financial stability. This was remarkable considering the damage which the civil wars had caused. Some of his achievements were:

- setting up a Council of Trade which sponsored new projects, e.g. silk making in Lyon, textiles in Rouen, tapestries at the Gobelins factory in Paris, muslin in Reims and silver and gold work at the Louvre
- investing in the infrastructure, e.g. roads, canals, bridges. Some schemes were very ambitious, e.g. linking the Mediterranean and the Atlantic; unfortunately the latter were never completed
- appointing a Controller of Commerce who was responsible for approving ventures such as silk manufacture.

He is also sometimes described as having great influence politically for example:

- he was said to have special commissioners (like the later 'intendants' who interfered in government in the provinces, and sometimes intervened in decisions made by the law courts
- all royal nominations to positions in government and orders to the courts to register edicts were handled by his department.

Greengrass, however, suggests that this was never at a strategic level; Sully was a practical man and not a theorist.

Sully clearly contributed widely. Not only was he active in the economic, financial and political sphere, he was also thought to be influential in foreign affairs although the extent to which Henry might have accepted his advice cannot be assessed. On the more negative side, although he was a loyal supporter of Henry IV, there were suspicions that he had also amassed a personal fortune from his work for the crown, despite the fact that he did receive many salaries and pensions quite legitimately from the king. However, his foresight and ruthless approach to economic and financial reform undoubtedly contributed enormously to the stabilisation of France in the reign of Henry IV.

Good answers will demonstrate clearly the qualities required to reach Level 4 and Level 5. They should show awareness of the need to challenge the question in order to assess the concept of 'greatest achievement'. Such responses will also understand the differences between Sully the man and Sully the loyal servant of the crown and how this may impinge on the judgement made.