



**General Certificate of Education
June 2010**

AS History 1041

HIS2C

Unit 2C

The Reign of Henry IV of France, 1589–1610

Final

Mark Scheme

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

June 2010

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

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

Question 1

01 Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from the views in **Source A** in relation to Henry IV's position in the years 1589 to 1593. (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 should be able to make comparisons between the views of the sources. The differences include:

- Source A indicates that Henry of Navarre had been acknowledged as the heir by Henry III as long as he was willing to become a Catholic although Source B suggests greater strength of opposition to him even if he did convert
- Source A suggests that Henry IV's position was very weak politically internally, but Source B suggests that once it was evident that he was being instructed in Catholicism, the opposition of the League diminished

- Source B emphasises the influence of the Edict of Nantes and suggests this provided 'concord and tranquility' in France which contrasts with the view in Source A of the 'endangered existence of the Huguenot party'
- Source A focuses on the immediate situation, e.g. the accession in 1589 emphasising that antagonistic attitudes of Catholics making Henry's position weak, whereas Source B considers the longer term to 1593, and sees Henry as stronger following his absolution and declaring himself a catholic
- the sources have differing views of the outcome by 1593; Source A suggesting a more cautious view than that of Source B of a ruler opposed by Catholics and not quite trusted by the Huguenots. In conclusion, his position in 1593 was therefore still insecure.

The similarities include:

- both sources indicate that Catholics opposed Henry's accession thus placing Henry in a weak position despite the fact that Source B suggests that he hoped to gain Catholic support
- Sources A and B also suggest that Henry was initially weak and even some of his own supporters were deserting him
- both sources suggest that it took time for Henry to be accepted as King
- both sources suggest that Huguenots and Catholics alike regarded his conversion as insincere in the first instance

They should apply their own knowledge of context to explain these comparisons:

- increased hostility between Catholics and Protestants in Europe, e.g. the formation of Leagues such as the Evangelical Union could further provoke the unsettled situation in France
- external factors made Henry IV stronger, e.g. the death of Philip II of Spain meant Catholics had more limited support from abroad
- all of Europe was aware Henry was not a Catholic and took no action; both Spain and most of Europe therefore implicitly strengthened Henry's position
- Henry's abjuration was perhaps the most important of all the events of this period; a truce with the Catholics was made in August 1593 following his abjuration of Protestantism in July.

Question 1**02** Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

How important was the death of Philip II of Spain in enabling Henry IV to establish himself securely on the French throne by the end of 1598? (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 scheme.

Candidates should be able to draw information from the sources. This may include:

- **Source A:** it is clear that even Catholics in France, despite Henry's IV's conversion, did not trust him; even more reason for a devout Catholic such as Philip II to see him as an enemy; the death of Philip II was fortuitous and removed a considerable threat
- **Source B:** the threat from Philip II was clear to see when war broke out between the two countries in 1595; however, this served to unite the French behind their king and thus consolidate his authority. Henry's introduction of the Edict of Nantes two days before the Treaty which concluded the war was a well timed event; the French wanted peace and the Treaty and the Edict both offered this in different ways
- **Source C:** suggests there were other factors at work in addition to the reduction of the Spanish threat and his abjuration, e.g. Henry's negotiations with the towns which allowed them to exclude Protestants from worshipping in their town; this usually involved large transfers of money – the sources suggests a total 30-32 million livres. This achieved both a political end as well as some resolution of the Huguenot issue. We are told that Henry saw this as good value and better than direct action.

They should also provide detail from their own knowledge and may include:

- Philip III was not as committed as Philip II to the defence of Catholicism; it also meant that the remaining members of the Catholic League were less likely to oppose Henry without the support of Spain. Henry was free to consider internal affairs
- Henry was able to take advantage of external events, e.g. the issue of Saluzzo; the Treaty of Vervins laid down the need for arbitration over its ownership after its seizure by the duke of Savoy. Negotiations began but the duke failed to deliver. Henry went to war and gained Bresse, Bugey and Gex as a result. Baumgartner suggests that this was seen as a positive move by the Calvinists as these territories gave access to Geneva, home to Calvin and the centre of the Calvinist faith
- internal policies also were important, e.g. Sully, also a Protestant, had a significant role in government and his religion as well as his skill were important aspects of his success in reviving the country's financial and economic position, e.g. increasing the *gabelle* (salt tax), taxing office holders who could then sell off their posts as they wished. New industries began and old ones were developed, e.g. silk in Lyons, linen in Brittany
- Henry gave the Catholic League bribes; 4 million livres is suggested as the price for its support.

Good answers are likely to conclude that the death of Philip II removed a serious enemy, but Henry's actions and those of his government, particularly Sully, were probably more important as they showed his strengths over a period of time.

Question 2

03 Explain why the *chambres de l'Edit* (*chambres mis-parties*) were created. (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 this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Reasons that may be cited include:

- these bodies were part of the settlement after the Wars of Religion as agreed in the Edict of Nantes
- they were an attempt to provide Huguenots, who were now encouraged to settle in specific areas, with some protection. This followed the recognition that there were too many Huguenots to be removed
- they aimed to defuse conflict between Huguenots and Catholics and to promote their loyalty to France, the King and the government
- they allowed judgement of cases brought before them and thus gave Huguenots some credibility. However, they were granted at the king's discretion and dependent on the monarch's continued support
- to deal with all classes and operate across the whole of France, in large towns
- Henry IV needed the support of Huguenots, having been a Huguenot and the fact that a considerable number of nobles were Huguenots.

To reach the highest level, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, e.g. by linking the terms of the Treaty of Nantes with the issue of conflict. The Edict provided for a body to settle the issues of the wars and thus contain or eradicate conflict. Candidates should understand the links between religious issues and politics in this period. They might suggest that Henry's position was precarious and a non-confrontational way of dealing with religious issues was important and needed quickly.

Question 2

- 04** 'The religious problems of France had been solved by 1610.'
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.

Candidates should be aware that France was a state with two religions, Catholicism and Protestantism on Henry IV's accession. Henry IV's struggle for the throne was the point at which those two religions came together. He was a Huguenot before his abjuration; Catholicism was the major religion but the Wars of Religion in the latter half of the sixteenth century had led to a Protestant becoming king, although he abjured his Protestant faith to do so.

They should also understand that, by 1610, unit has not been fully achieved; Catholics and Protestants had to co-exist but they did not live in the same areas; the most that could be said was that in some places was that there was a guarded co-existence. Catholics were clearly the dominant group in terms of numbers and tradition.

The ways in which religious problems had been solved could be illustrated by:

- the safeguards offered by the Chambres de L'Edit to Huguenots; information here, however, should focus on the operation of these institutions rather than why or how they were set up, to avoid overlap with part (a) e.g. they were intended to implement the law of the land and therefore focused on keeping the peace, assigning punishment where required and ensuring that local officials did not abuse their authority, as well as acting as a court of appeal; the Chambre de L'Edit in Paris dealt with more than 400 cases involving some kind of violence between 1600 and 1610. Some punishments were harsh, e.g. banishment or even death although, e.g. between 1600 and 1610, 40 people were banished and 12 were condemned to death
- the restoration of property to the Catholic Church in 1596; this was repeated in the Edict of Nantes, 1598. Further legislation followed which brought some order to the Church, e.g. in 1606 gentlemen were forbidden to farm tithes and any other church revenues without express permission from the clergy
- standards of the clergy were also raised
- the decrees of the Council of Trent were not adopted wholesale and the Inquisition was not allowed into France
- Huguenots were allowed to hold some public offices.

However, these need to be balanced against the evidence that suggests there was still religious disunity, for example:

- some groups of monks became more religiously active and the Jesuits were allowed in to France; Henry IV linked this to their role as teachers and a new college was established at La Fleche; from this point their influence grew
- some books were banned
- Henry IV petitioned the pope to canonise Loyola
- Huguenots were not always treated well as not all areas of France accepted the Edict of Nantes
- worship was only allowed in western and southern France; Huguenots were allowed settlement in specified areas
- Huguenots were not allowed to discuss politics in their assemblies and officers of the crown could attend
- their survival depended on the goodwill and support of the crown; this was ultimately to be revoked in the next century.

Good answers (Level 4/Level 5) are likely to conclude that religious peace was not fully established or permanent but that the support of the government for Huguenots was the most significant factor in allowing a degree of co-existence. What occurred in France was kind of toleration but Catholicism was still the religion of the majority; the limited protection provided by the law is seen in the 17th century when Louis XIV revoked their privileges. Religious unity was not possible when Catholicism and the Huguenot faith were both present; toleration might be.

Question 3

05 Explain why France was in debt at the beginning of Henry IV's reign. (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 this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

There were a number of factors which explain the indebtedness of France at the beginning of Henry IV's reign e.g.:

- there was already a debt of 200,000 million livres when Henry came to the throne; income was approximately 30 million livres per annum; some of this was the consequence of the Wars of Religion
- the main direct tax was the *taille* which was administered in a complex manner – regional treasurers were given a target; they supervised local officials in the elections and they, in turn, supervised the parishes (approx 23,000)
- different officials collected these taxes
- indirect taxes such as the *gabelle* (salt tax) were contracted out; bids were taken, vetted and distributed; this tax farming system was inefficient
- often tax farmers had to provide money for the banks in advance of collecting the taxes; this meant some estimation of yields in advance – which were not always accurate; many of them were out by at least a third
- Italian banks gave loans – which had to be repaid

- accounting systems were slow and so the exact state of the country's finances was always quite difficult to measure, e.g. the chief treasurer in 1605 did not submit his accounts until 1617. Each layer of officials tended to blame the others
- the Wars of Religion meant that some taxes, e.g. the *taille*, were not regularly collected but that expenses for the military were rising.

To reach the highest level, answers may emphasise the context of war which had reduced income for the Crown extensively. Combined with existing debt and some incompetency in administration of financial affairs this made the financial situation grave.

Question 3

- 06** 'The *paulette* was the most successful measure in Sully's financial reforms.'
Explain why you agree and 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.

Candidates will need to balance evidence which suggests that the *paulette* was the most successful measure against that which suggests a different conclusion.

The *paulette* might be seen as the most successful reform because:

- it had a wide appeal to office holders and to the king, e.g. it provided one-sixtieth of the value of the office to the government
- it was easily administered; it could be farmed out
- it gave a steady annual income
- it discouraged fraud; records could be kept
- it was an opportunity to remind office holders that they worked for the king and their loyalty was expected
- there was a steady demand for these posts, despite a doubling in the purchase price by 1609
- new groups of people became interested in the posts and this breathed some new life into the system
- there is little evidence to suggest that market in the sale of posts drew money away from other activities such as trade.

However, alternative views might include:

- it was seen by some as offensive largely because it was so different; office holders should not be controlled in this way
- others thought that the king would no longer be able to control office holders
- possibly the biggest concern was that the price of the office could rise and the office holder had no control over this
- there was also a view that this system would take money out of circulation and there would be little left to invest in new opportunities (on the assumption that there was a finite amount of money in circulation).

Candidates might also refer to Sully's other reforms and balance the success of the *paulette* against these:

- Sully paid back 'expenses' debts and pensions slowly but methodically; this did not prevent some angry nobles from threatening Sully
- he established committees to gather information about the true value of the king's debt; some was to be 'written off' or repaid at less than the full value
- he tried to repurchase royal lands
- town councils were investigated
- more indirect taxation was imposed, e.g. the *gabelle* or salt tax was increased and citizens were required to purchase certain quantities
- a sales tax (the *pancarte*) was set up for 3 years; it resulted in riots, e.g. in Poitiers 1601, Limoges 1602; it was abandoned at the end of the year
- an edict was published regarding abuse of the collection of the *taille*
- tax farmers were investigated and fraud when discovered was punished
- expenditure was more closely controlled; military expenditure remained at a fairly high level but court expenses were cut.

Although the *paulette* is seen by Greengrass as Henry's 'most notorious measure' because it broke with current practice i.e. it could be inherited, therefore encouraging corruption. However, it did seem to be successful and was valued by its holders despite the rising purchase prices.

The *paulette* was an obvious target for critics and although it was radical for its day but it was also successful in creating a band of civil servants who assisted Sully in making France more financially secure than he found it.

Good answers (Level 4/Level 5) are likely to balance the issues suggested. Candidates should comment on the extensive nature of the reforms and draw an effective conclusion about the role of the *paulette* as 'the most successful measure'.