

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2012 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

9769 HISTORY

9769/21

Paper 2A (European History Outlines c.300–c.1516),
maximum raw mark 90

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

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

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2012 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and must be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners should give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They should be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit should be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of perhaps unremarkable material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners should use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It should go without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners are also asked to bear in mind, when reading the following, that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may well yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 2 mark.
- (e) The Band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners should first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

Band 1: 25–30

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this Band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. Use of English will be clear and fluent with excellent vocabulary and virtually error-free.

Band 2: 19–24

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary. Use of English will be highly competent, clear, generally fluent and largely error-free.

Band 3: 13–18

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

Band 4: 7–12

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may well be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated. Some errors of English will be present but written style should be clear although lacking in real fluency.

Band 5: 0–6

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; unsupported generalisations, vagueness and irrelevance are all likely to be on show. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources is not to be expected. The answer may well be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

Section 1: c.300–c. 632

1 To what extent did the Roman Empire revive under Constantine?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the reunification of the Empire, reforms in administration and government, the conversion of the Emperor to Christianity and the founding of Constantinople.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. The question asks candidates to come to a judgement. On the one hand they could argue that Constantine's conversion, along with the moving of the capital of the Empire signified a revival. Persecution of Christians could be viewed as having sapped the strength of the Empire and the building of Constantinople echoed the great projects of earlier Emperors. Constantine harnessed the cohesion of Christianity and was fully credited by writers such as Eusebius. His administration benefited from more settled conditions and trade could flourish especially in the eastern Mediterranean. He ended the debasement with a new gold coin, the solidus. Reforms introduced earlier began to work their way through to being effective. Alternatively, the establishment of Constantinople weakened the unity of the Empire in the long run, while the top-heavy and corrupt bureaucracy remained powerful. Fierce taxation was necessary to maintain the government. The army had become more and more composed of semi-barbarians as Roman citizens became more peaceful in their outlook and this was a bad omen for the future. On balance a considerable revival could well be the conclusion.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

2 Assess the reasons why rulers in fifth-century Italy found it so difficult to hold on to power.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the decline of the Roman army, the power of the invading Vandals and Goths, economic problems and the impact of individuals.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates could argue that the key factor was the inability of the Roman army to sustain its previous role in maintaining order. Instead it disintegrated into war bands under rival leaders, who overthrew each other and thus led to short-lived reigns. The careers of Aetius and Odovacer could be quoted to show that generals of ability could hold on to power for longer. Alternative explanations could come from the invasions of the barbarians, their military strength and the often limited response from within Italy. The sacking of Rome in 410 and the attacks of Attila could be quoted as events which encouraged prospective imitators. The need for new rulers to conciliate those who had helped them to power and the consequent problems arising from this could be a factor.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

3 How far did doctrinal disputes weaken the fifth-century church?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates can refer to doctrinal disputes such as over the Nestorians, who believed in two natures and two persons in Christ, the Monophysites who believed in one nature in one person and the Council of Chalcedon which favoured two natures in one person. These disputes even extended to the monks in the African desert. The Pelagian challenge to original sin and predestination was another dispute and the fall of Rome led pagans to claim that Christianisation was to blame. There was also discord over the primacy of Rome over Constantinople and Alexandria.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates are likely to argue that the church survived. The Council of Chalcedon settled the issue over the nature of Christ. The growth of monasticism showed the appeal of the message that salvation came from abandoning possessions and human ties. St Anthony was the main proponent of this belief. The Pelagians were bludgeoned by the work of St Augustine and his *De Civitate Dei* outlined the role of the church in the world, which Pope Gelasius further defined. St Jerome's Latin version of the Bible was a valuable resource. It could be argued that such civilisation as survived the Dark Ages did so because of the church. Alternatively, the heresies lingered, notably the Monophysites in Syria and Egypt where rival bishops even had their opponents murdered. Acrimonious conflict between Rome and Constantinople rumbled on. The monks were often difficult to control and the pillar saints were mostly keen Monophysites.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

4 Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the Visigoths in Gaul.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the nature of the rule of the kings, the individual achievements of some of them and the role of the Gallo-Romans

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates are likely to argue that the Visigoth strengths include the conquests of King Euric and his intention to establish a great Empire in the West as well as his law code, written in Latin which showed a sign of a growing civilisation among the Visigoths. He had control of the church and a government system based on the *dux* and the *comes*. The weaknesses of the Visigoths can be seen as outweighing the strengths in that they never assimilated with the Gallo-Roman inhabitants and took both land and taxes from them. They were Arians and hostile to Catholicism. When Alaric II succeeded his father he was ineffectual against Clovis, who was welcomed by the Catholics. His concessions to Catholics came too late, even if his law code for the Gallo-Romans had some merits.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

5 How far were Justinian's problems of his own making?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may discuss the problems which Justinian faced, from the Nika riots to the expansion and defence of his empire. Religious and administrative problems could also be considered.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates are likely to conclude that Justinian's aims and character were responsible for many of his problems. His invasion of Italy might be seen as the root cause leading to financial and military pressures. His religious persecution stemmed from his own beliefs. His autocratic rule similarly emanated from his view of his role. Alternatively, the Nika riots resulted very much from the circumstances in Constantinople and the success of his invasion of Africa may have led him to think that other campaigns would go equally well. The size of his empire made it difficult to govern and control. Some of his ministers and generals were not all that adept.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 10	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

Section 2: c.632–c.919

6 How great a contribution did Pepin III make to the increasing power of the Carolingians?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the military achievements of Pepin, his recognition as king and his assistance to the pope.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates can argue that Pepin made a real contribution. He consolidated the conquests of his father, Charles Martel, intervening in Bavaria and other parts of Germany to ensure their rulers were allies. The Franks were well organised for war and the annual Marchfield assembly could authorise campaigns. In 751 he felt strong enough to dispense with the weak Merovingians and make himself king with papal backing. In the latter years of his reign he assisted the pope against the Lombard king twice and was active against the Saxons and in Aquitaine. Alternatively, candidates could suggest that Pepin's early years were much less successful and Aquitaine, in particular, broke free on the death of Charles Martel and was only subdued much later and at some cost. For a period Pepin let Aquitaine alone, tacitly recognising its independence. It could be argued that the Frankish Annals, which began in the late 780s or early 790s give greater credit to Pepin than he merited. But candidates are likely to conclude that Pepin made possible the achievements of Charlemagne.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 11	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

7 'Charlemagne's chief motivation was religious.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A variety of material can be used to answer this question and not all aspects need to be covered for higher Bands. Charlemagne's motives for his military conquests, for his administrative reforms, for his patronage of scholarship and learning and for his acceptance of the title of Emperor could all be used.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates could argue that Charlemagne was personally religiously minded and so was motivated by his beliefs. He enforced conversion on the Saxons, he went to the aid of the Pope against the Lombards and he fought the Arabs in Spain. His main motive in promoting educational reform and encouraging foreign scholars such as Alcuin was to improve the quality of his clergy and thus make worship more worthy of its object. The Capitularies express his motives clearly. He linked the moral health of his church with the material prosperity of his empire. From 800, after his coronation by the Pope, his views and policies were even more religiously slanted, perhaps in a conscious attempt at a Holy Empire. The alternative argument could focus on his desire for conquest in itself and the need for regular access to booty to keep the Carolingian nobility contented. The Saxons were recurrent opponents and Charlemagne wanted to defeat them as much as to convert them. His attitude to the Arabs was similar. His administration aimed at keeping the loyalty of his subjects and the drawing up of law codes had a good impact in the sphere of law and order. There is also debate about how Charlemagne really saw his coronation and how far his policies changed as a result. Candidates may well conclude that, while religion mattered to Charlemagne, he was not blind to the possibility of material as well as spiritual gain.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 12	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

8 'The Carolingian Empire was too vast.' Is this the main explanation for its failure to endure?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. The size of the Empire was a contributory factor and candidates should give it substantial consideration. Other issues might be the extent of resistance within the empire, the quality of its rulers and the attitudes of its nobility.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. One view could be that the size of the empire was a problem and had been so under Charlemagne. His absence at one of the edges of his lands was often to give opportunities to ambitious subjects and enemies at the opposite edge. The internal governmental structure of the empire was not a coherent whole and there was little political cohesion, let alone linguistic or cultural. Alternatively, candidates may argue that Charlemagne, like many great rulers, lacked heirs who were equally gifted. Louis made some unwise decisions, although recent historians have been less critical of his coronation by the Pope and of his arrangements for the succession. Problems over the inheritance under later rulers was a contributory factor to decline. Louis' nephew Bernard led a revolt when he felt undervalued by Louis' proposals and the coup of 830 is a further example. The factionalism in the ruling family was echoed in the aristocracy. The significance of the Imperial title seems to have become a minor issue. Candidates may conclude that the latter factors were worsened by the size of the Empire, but that the succession problems and dispute were crucial in weakening the Carolingians.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 13	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

9 Why did Western European rulers find it hard to resist the Viking attacks and invasions?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates could refer to the nature of Viking attacks and their determination to maintain their settlements. The lack of naval resources and of a concerted resistance were other explanations.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates could consider a number of possible explanations. The Vikings had traded all over Europe so knew their territory. The sudden and vicious nature of the first Viking attacks made them hard to resist. Their targeting of monastic establishments meant they concentrated on soft, wealthy institutions which could not mount a defence. They were prepared to be brutal. Their ships were well designed for the task they had in mind. Attempts to pay them off simply led to greater demands. Some rulers even gave them land. They took advantage of the situation in Europe, benefiting from the divisions in the Carolingian empire and the chance to make alliances with one side or the other in civil conflicts. Candidates might conclude that no one explanation is the key and that the answer lies in a combination of Viking strength and European lack of a coherent response.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 14	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

10 To what extent had an effective monarchical structure emerged in Germany by 919?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might discuss the Treaty of Verdun in 843 and its consequences, the abilities of the various rulers of Germany and the extent of their powers and control.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates could argue that the German monarchy was established as such after 843 and a series of kings governed from Aachen as the heirs of Charlemagne but with far less power. The meaning of the title of Emperor could be considered. Alternatively the continued dissension about the succession and the challenge from princes such as the Bavarian rulers might suggest that a monarchical structure had not yet been accepted by all Germans.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 15	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

Section 3:c.919–1099

11 Assess the strengths of Otto III as a ruler.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may mention the shortness of the reign which makes judgements difficult and consider the nature of Otto's court, his kingship in Germany and Italy and his relationship with the Papacy.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates could argue that Otto initiated some Byzantine practices at his court and intended to revive the position of the Emperor as in the time of the Carolingians. He was successful in ensuring the election of a Pope of his choosing as Sylvester II. He restored Aachen and reburied Charlemagne in a more grandiose setting. He dismissed the concept of the Donation of Constantine as a forgery and made it clear that papal authority was subordinate to the Emperor. Alternatively, candidates could suggest that the brief reign meant these initiatives were short-lived, that Otto could not solve the underlying problem of the Empire which was that his presence was needed both in Germany and Italy to ensure his power was recognised and that his enforced flight from Rome and subsequent death from malaria in 1002 ended his ambitions. The conclusion may well be that his aims were probably unlikely to have been achieved with any permanence as the 'feudal revolution' changed the way a state was viewed.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 16	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

12 How is the survival of the early Capetian kings (987–1108) best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might refer to the relatively small land-holding of the Capetians, their relationships with the other rulers of France, the succession, their relationship with the church and the strength of the royal tradition in France.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates could argue that the survival of the Capetians is unexpected but was nevertheless maintained. The Capetians had the benefit of being perceived as the heirs of Charlemagne. They were crowned at Reims, even though their control over it territorially was insecure. Hugh Capet allied with Normandy to help improve his authority in Northern France and left Anjou and Blois to fight each other. He defeated Duke Charles of Lower Lorraine. His three successors saw the royal demesne under threat but they all managed to keep some power and concentrated on extending their control over their hereditary lands. They laid the foundation for the extension of the rule of their successors. Any factor could be argued to be the most important but their main asset is likely to be identified as their support from the church which enabled them to crown their heirs as kings in their lifetimes.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 17	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

13 How far did the Normans succeed in imposing their authority in Sicily?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates are likely to discuss the acquisition of Sicily by the sons of Tancred and the achievements of Robert Guiscard, Roger II and Frederick II.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may argue that at their peak the Norman rulers of Sicily were very much in control. The Sicilian state was strong enough to survive the regency of Roger II and it was closely linked to southern Italy. They developed an excellent administrative system, largely using Greek civil servants while relying on their Norman followers for their military support. Roger established Roman Law in Sicily and his government has been described as 'the most mature in western Europe'. He had an impressive navy and did not feel bound to obey the Pope. He defeated and captured Innocent II. The alternative view could be illustrated by reference to the problems which beset Sicily whenever it lacked a strong monarch. The minority of Frederick II was one example. The influence of the Norman barons was never cowed permanently, the church was also never completely subjugated and the dual claims of Sicily and mainland Italy remained problematic.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 18	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

14 What were the principal achievements of Gregory VII?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates are likely to consider the reforms promulgated by Gregory and evaluate the extent to which they were successful in their aims.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may argue that Gregory's main achievement lay in the way in which he raised the whole issue of papal supremacy. In order to carry out reforms such as ending simony and clerical marriage, he needed co-operation from the bishops. Many of them were appointed and invested by lay rulers and hence owed more allegiance to lay than spiritual leaders. Thus he revived the strictures of canon law to take control of these appointments. But, in addition, he extended the authority of the pope by insisting that archbishops should receive the pallium from him and by sending papal legates into most provinces. His defeat of the Emperor and his use of the weapon of excommunication were more controversial and his final rescue at the hands of the Normans saw Rome destroyed and Gregory's subsequent exile and death. Candidates can assess how permanent the effects of his reign were, looking at his successors and the impact on the Empire.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 19	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

15 How convincing is the view of the First Crusade as a 'religious war'?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may examine the various motives for the participants on the crusade. These could include the reasons why Urban II made his appeal at Clermont, why the Franks and others answered it so eagerly and why the masses led by Peter the Hermit joined in. The situation in the Holy Land is likely to be explained as well.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may well argue that the crusade was religious in that its prime aim, as outlined by Urban, was to end the situation where the Turks were barring Christian pilgrims from access to the Holy Sites. There were spiritual gains to be made by crusaders. During the fighting, events like the finding of the Holy Lance encouraged the fervour of the troops. Many of those who cried 'Deus Vult' were genuine in their religious feeling. The poorer crusaders also were often inspired by religious motives. The Turkish viewpoint could also be considered as to how far they saw the crusaders as a threat to Islam or as a threat to their control of the area. The alternative view is that there were secular motives as well and that the acquisition of land and wealth was in the minds of some. Alexius II certainly felt the armies were a threat to his position and he was keen to move them on rapidly from Constantinople. The actions of Bohemond at Antioch look like a bid for secular power. Candidates might conclude that the separation of religious and secular factors was alien to the period and so mixed motives would be the norm.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 20	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

Section 4: 1085–1250

16 Why did Germany suffer so much civil strife from 1125 to 1152?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the election of a successor to Henry V, the ambitions of Lothar, Duke of Saxony and Henry, Duke of Bavaria and the incapacity of Conrad III.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may argue that the underlying cause was the rivalry between the Guelfs and the Ghibellines and the conflict between those who had supported Emperor Henry V and those who opposed him. The fact that Henry V died childless opened up a dispute about the succession and the choice of Lothar of Saxony, a Guelf, rather than Frederick, Duke of Swabia, a Ghibelline, compounded the situation. In 1138 the prospect of the election of Henry, Duke of Bavaria as Emperor worried the baronage as he was also likely to inherit Saxony and so overwhelm them. The Hohenstaufen Conrad was chosen as Emperor and as a Ghibelline continued the feuding and although he tried to reduce Guelf power, they fought back. The final judgement may lie between the circumstances and the individuals.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 21	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

17 'Frederick Barbarossa's greatest talents were as a statesman and diplomat.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might refer to Frederick's achievements in restoring imperial power in Germany, his vision of his position as Emperor, his incursions into Italy, his relations with the church and his dealings with the German princes, notably Henry the Lion.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates could argue that Frederick was indeed a statesman and diplomat, citing his policy of collaboration in Germany to solve the issues of old rivalries and his recognition of the new feudal reality there. His reconciliation with the pope at Anagni in 1176 shows his acknowledgement of the reality of his situation in Italy. The Peace of Constance and the Diet at Mainz could be other examples. But Frederick had other attributes. He was a military leader, who forcibly restored order in Italy and defeated Henry the Lion in Germany. He saw his position as Emperor as giving him supreme power in Europe and even advanced the Duke of Bohemia to the rank of king. He had ambition in building up his demesne lands. He was prepared to join in the crusading movement. Candidates may conclude that these latter attributes nearly all led to disappointments, or even in the case of the crusade, death, for Frederick and hence his attributes which accounted for his successes are the more vital.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 22	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

18 'Too pious to be an effective medieval monarch.' Consider this judgement on Louis VII.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might refer to Louis VII's war with Theobald, his role as a crusader, his attitude to Eleanor of Aquitaine and to Thomas Becket. Abbot Suger could also be mentioned. Louis' rivalry with Henry II is a key issue.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates could argue that Louis was too pious. The massacre at Vitry in his war with Theobald of Champagne appalled him and influenced other decisions, notable his desire to live at peace with his ambitious Angevin neighbours. He went on the Second Crusade which led to marital problems. He sheltered Becket which exacerbated the hostility between himself and Henry II. He was seen as too pliant in the hands of Suger and Bernard of Clairvaux. Alternatively, these supposed failings did not prevent Louis from laying the foundations for the development of the French monarchy which his son took to a peak. Arguably, despite his indecisiveness in dealing with Henry II, it was the latter's plans to divide up his lands among his sons which led two of them to acknowledge Louis as their overlord, which weakened the Angevin hold on France. At Toulouse in 1159 Louis showed astuteness. Abbot Suger was an able advisor, who ruled wisely as regent during the crusade. Even the loss of Eleanor and her lands did not eventually prove a disaster. The conclusion could be that Louis showed that piety did not automatically mean a medieval king was a failure.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 23	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

19 Was Philip Augustus able to defeat the Angevins because he was strong or because they were weak?

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the long conflict between Philip and the Angevins, from the war between the Angevin brothers in 1183, Philip's intervention and alliance with Richard, the fall-out from the Third Crusade and the Treaty of Le Goulet with its impact in the reign of John, ending with the battle of Bouvines in 1214.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may argue that Philip was strong in that his lands were united and the French succession was not complicated by warring brothers. He built up his demesne and his financial resources probably outdid those of his enemies. He was a determined and formidable foe. On the other hand, the Angevins were beset with difficulties. Fraternal strife was rife until 1199 and Philip benefited shrewdly in his alliance with the discontented John. Richard's obsession with the crusade and his absence was a weakness, made worse by his capture and the need to raise a vast ransom and then his untimely and unnecessary death. John made error after error, from his unwise marriage to his murder of Arthur, which led to his condemnation at Philip's court. His military incapacity, the loss of Chateau Gaillard and Normandy, his quarrel with the pope and the final loss of all but Aquitaine showed him as an unworthy opponent. But candidates could suggest that circumstances were against John rather than that he was essentially weak.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 24	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

20 'To what extent did Innocent III emerge victorious from his dealings with the rulers of Western Europe?'

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to Innocent's intervention in France over the marriage of Philip Augustus, in England over the choice of Archbishop of Canterbury, in the Iberian peninsula on a variety of issues and in Languedoc over the Cathars.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may argue that Innocent was successful in that Philip eventually took back his wife, Ingeborg, King John gave in and accepted Langton as archbishop and did homage for his realm to the pope. He intervened in Portugal and Aragon to uphold papal rights, brought about the submission of the king of Leon, co-ordinated campaigns against the Moors and inspired Simon de Montfort to extirpate the Cathars in 1209 and overthrow Raymond of Toulouse. He imposed papal taxes on rulers after the Lateran Council in 1215. This judgement could be qualified by the argument that Philip Augustus and King John both held out against the pope with some success and neither suffered evil consequences until late in their quarrel when each of them gave in and obtained subsequent advantage. Philip refused to take the Cross against the Cathars as he was pursuing his war against the Angevins. Thus the conclusion may be that Innocent was less successful than at first he might appear to have been.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 25	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

Section 5: Themes c.300–c.1200

21 Assess the reasons for the changes in population levels either in the period c.400–c.800 or in the period c.1000–c.1200.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates are likely to suggest that the population declined in the first period and was rising in the second.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may argue that the decline from 400 owed much to the failure of supplies of food and water as the Roman Empire tottered. Egypt and Tunisia fell to Muslims or Vandals disrupting the corn supply and the barbarian invasions were not helpful to settled agriculture and transport was severely affected. There was a plague in 542, similar to the Black Death, which exacted a heavy toll. For the later period, candidates may argue that some of the problems of production of food had been overcome. The introduction of water-mills freed up much labour as previously milling had all been done by hand. Water-mills needed weirs which were themselves good fisheries and so added to the food supply. Iron was used increasingly for agricultural tools, especially ploughs, which enabled heavier land to be cleared. In Eastern Europe this was crucial. Everywhere fens and marshes were being drained. Hence a larger population could be maintained. The rise in recruits to monasteries in the period attests to the rising population.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 26	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

22 How are the fluctuating fortunes of towns in the period c.400–c.1000 best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may put forward a variety of explanations, preferably with examples. Some range should be expected but the whole of Europe need not be covered. Italy is likely to feature strongly.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may argue that factors such as invasions from north and east in Europe had a big impact on towns. As the Romans retreated town life foundered. The growth of towns again tended to come about with the development of trade and the need for ports and trading centres. In Italy sophisticated cities became financial centres. Capital cities expanded to reflect the ambitions of rulers. Bishops enhanced cathedral cities. Towns attracted surplus populations. The economic impetus may well be seen as the major contributor.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 27	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

23 'An age of reform.' How appropriate is this description of monasticism in the period c.910–c.1200.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the establishment of monastic institutions in France, England, Germany and Italy and are likely to focus on the impact of the abbey at Cluny and of Bernard of Clairvaux and the Cistercians.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates could argue that Cluny was significant as a reformed branch of the Benedictine order and from the impact of its second abbot, Odo, who reformed the Italian monasteries and Fleury on the Loire. Later abbots had a similar impact and won from the pope freedom from episcopal jurisdiction. The abbey was rebuilt and became an example of the best monastic life, especially under the Abbot Odilo, and influenced monastic reform in France, Normandy and England, where St Dunstan had sparked a revival by founding Glastonbury. The Cistercians were spurred on by Bernard of Clairvaux and their disciplined approach attracted numerous novices and monks. They managed to avoid the rich decoration and endowments of the Benedictines and won respect from all. In England they were notable sheep farmers but in Europe it was Bernard who really drove their influence, travelling and preaching widely and ready to give moral advice to the powerful as well as to the peasant. He preached in favour of the crusades and helped in the formation of the military orders. Without his abilities and zeal, the Cistercians would have accomplished far less. Both these were reforming orders and they attracted lay patronage from monarchs and nobles. Candidates could suggest that medieval monasticism tended to follow a pattern of foundation, growth, deviation and reform.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 28	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

24 How strong were the Crusader States up to 1204?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the establishment of the Crusader States in the First Crusade, their fortunes in the succeeding period and the setting up of the military orders and the reasons for their demise.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates might argue that the Crusader States had some strengths in the power of their defences through castles such as Krak des Chevaliers and the aid of the Templars and Hospitallers. Kings like Baldwin I and II were able to control their vassals, who were often of relatively low birth and so less challenging than nobles in Europe. Some of their early rulers were men of ability and they adopted sensible policies towards the Muslim majority over whom they ruled. There was disunity among the Muslims. Their weaknesses lay in their small numbers and the length of time it took for reinforcements to arrive. Problems with rulers such as Baldwin and Guy de Lusignan did not help. They were unable to resist leaders like Nur-ad-Din and Saladin and the idea of Jihad. The battle of Hattin was a decisive blow. There was disunity among crusaders. Candidates might conclude that it was never likely that the Crusader States could last once the Muslim forces were united against them.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 29	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

25 'Gothic architecture was the greatest cultural achievement of the twelfth century.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the widespread adoption of Gothic architecture in northern France and in England. They may set this against the intellectual achievements of the period.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may argue that the move from Romanesque to Gothic was based on knowledge of engineering and in particular, the ribbed vault, the pointed arch and the flying buttress which allowed for the construction of buildings of light and intricacy in place of the solid gloom which preceded Gothic. Some examples could be expected. In contrast the so-called twelfth-century Renaissance is seen as a thirst for knowledge emerging from the ideals of the day expressed in the Investiture Contest or the Crusades. Examples quoted might include the increase in book production and in libraries, the purification and exaltation of the Latin language, the writing of history, often from a moral viewpoint, the codification of Canon Law, the dissemination of Arabic learning, the impact of the Italian universities in law and medicine and the more secular flowering of chivalric literature in the *chansons* and in the troubadours. Deciding which of these is the key achievement could depend on the influence of each and Gothic might be the winner on the grounds of longevity.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 30	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

26 How is the depth of hostility to heretics in the period 1150–c.1300 best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates could refer to the persecution of the Waldenses and the Cathars and to other examples of challenges to the generally held beliefs.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may argue that this is an issue of authority. Heretics challenged the authority of the church and this was feared as a move in the direction of a challenge to the state and hence to instability and chaos, a condition equally displeasing to God and to his world. If the church was wrong doctrinally or there were alternative routes to salvation, then there was no guarantee that the rest of its message could be trusted. Heretics were protected by secular rulers who had their own ambitions to throw off an unwelcome authority. The domination of the church in the society of the time is another factor. Candidates could also suggest that clearly some were not hostile to heretics and embraced their beliefs and indeed were prepared to die, often horribly, in the cause.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 31	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

Section 6: 1250–1378

27 Did anyone benefit from the war of the Sicilian Vespers?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the long struggle for the control of Sicily, a vital trading post, ending with the Aragonese in control there and the Angevins retaining the southern mainland.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates could argue that the 20 years of war benefited few. The emperor was no longer a great power in Sicily. The popes became caught up in their determination to maintain the Angevins there with a loss of prestige and even Boniface VIII could not achieve his aims. His methods led to the attempt by the French to kidnap him at Anagni. Repercussions were felt in the disorder in Rome and Florence. The Angevins lost control of Sicily and had to be content with Naples. All the original protagonists died in the course of the wars.

On a more positive note, the Sicilians held out in very difficult circumstances and their nationalism survived betrayal and invasion. The Aragonese ended up as the rulers of Sicily and became a new player in this part of the Mediterranean.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 32	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

28 How important was the quality of their leaders to the Mongol expansion of the later thirteenth and fourteenth centuries?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the Mongol invasions in Russia and Hungary and parts of the Turkish empire. The nature of leadership could be discussed.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may argue that the nature of the Mongol tribal institutions gave their rulers, from the Great Khan downwards, supreme power and hence their expansion would depend on the leadership. But there are other factors, such as the disunity of their opponents in places such as Russia, where the princes vied with each other. The tactics of the Mongols including their rapid advances and their scorched earth strategy played a role. The horrors of their invasion of Hungary led to other places surrendering. But this could also lead to more determined resistance. Some Mongol groups were motivated by Islam.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 33	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

29 Assess the view that Louis IX deserves his reputation as a great Christian king.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to Louis' dealings with rebels in the south, his crusading interests, his role as an arbiter, his administration of France and his attitude to the church and the papacy.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may argue that Louis deserves his reputation as a man of scrupulous honesty, who would have preferred the life of a monk and who embarked on no new conquests but concentrated on making his subjects willing to be loyal to him. He treated his vassals fairly and so won their trust. He maintained his own rights, but did not exceed them. He sent out commissions to enquire if royal rights had been abused by his officials. He led two crusades, although neither of them was successful. He settled the issue of the inheritance of the county of Flanders and was arbiter between Henry III and his barons in the Mise of Amiens. He built churches and took care over church appointments. He was canonised shortly after his death. The alternative view might be that he ruled absolutely and could be over-zealous in punishing blasphemers, in enforcing the Inquisition and in some of his financial exactions. Candidates will probably agree with the verdict in the question.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 34	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

30 'The main aim of Philip the Fair was to humiliate the Papacy.' Do you agree?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the main issues of Philip IV's reign, such as his relations with the Papacy, the affair of the Templars, his wars with Flanders and England, his governmental methods and relations with his vassals.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may argue that Philip was bent on humiliating the Papacy after Boniface VIII insisted that clerical taxation needed the agreement of the pope and further claimed the right to try any bishop accused by the royal courts, culminating in a statement that Philip was subordinate to the pope. The capture of Boniface at Anagni followed. The Templar trials also needed papal support and Philip did eventually get this from the Avignon Papacy of Clement on terms which were wholly favourable to himself. Alternatively, candidates could argue that the pursuit of the popes resulted from Philip's aim to deal with threats in Flanders and Aquitaine and that this required money and the church was the most likely source of the wealth he needed. Thus his attacks on the church could be seen as secondary. His heavy taxes on laity as well as the church and his calling of the Estates-General to agree to his taxes illustrate this and his use of legally trained advisors like Nogaret supports the view. Candidates could conclude that Philip was pushed into his hostility to the Papacy rather than starting his reign with that attitude.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 35	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

31 'The city states of Italy experienced 'increased disorder' during the fourteenth century.'
Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the chequered history of a number of city states but Florence and Milan are likely to feature.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may argue that disorder increased in the century. The lack of a central authority and the decline of imperial influence could be quoted. The Papacy was in Avignon for much of the period. The invasions and ambitions of Emperors, Popes and the Kings of Naples had encouraged foreign incursions and the mercenaries did not all return home. The ravages of the free companies were the result and they were responsible for the decline of Siena. The feuds within the city states of North Italy were interminable and often led to the rise of a city tyrant who might restore order but with a heavy hand, such as the Malatesta of Rimini. The brief ascendancy and overthrow of Rienzo in Rome illustrates the problems. Florence was immersed in a war to destroy Pisa and suffered from the bankruptcy of the Bardi and Peruzzi leading to near civil war between the oligarchs and the people. But candidates could point out that the economy continued to flourish and Florence was surprisingly ready to develop at the end of the century. The end of the Great Schism was another positive sign.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 36	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

Section 7: c. 1378–c.1461

32 'Overall, the conciliar movement must be deemed a failure.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the conciliar movement should not score highly. There should be awareness of what the conciliar movement involved, and also knowledge of some of the principal sessions such as Pisa, Constance, Siena and Basle. The schism was finally healed, but the nationalistic 'divisions' remained, as did many of the failings of the papacy. A list of what the causes of the Reformation were is not looked for.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Some analysis of the concept of 'failure' in this context is called for, and candidates who really develop this line of thought deserve reward. There is a case to be made each way. The institution did survive, and while it did face up to the challenge of Hus – eventually – it was not in a strong position to face that of Luther. Expect a balanced analysis and completely one sided responses, however well argued, should not be over-rewarded.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 37	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

33 Why did Burgundy play such a central role in the politics and diplomacy of this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. A range of factors should be considered. Possible ones are the cohesion and wealth of the region, the relationship with England, the competence of rulers – they tended to be good politicians – the acquisitions and the problems facing the French such as Agincourt.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Identification of a central reason is one approach, provided there are good cases made and clear indication of why it is the most important. An 'internal versus external factors' argument is equally acceptable, but hopefully it should have a clear focus one way or the other. Some thinking about how 'central' a role Burgundy had, is fine, but candidates who try and adapt this sort of question to their own ends and argue that it did not, should not get far. Prioritising the reasoning is expected, and this will lift it from the narrative.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 38	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

34 Discuss the view that weak and divided opponents provide the main explanation for the rapid expansion of the Ottoman Empire in this period.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. A case can be made both ways, ranging on one side with Greek disunity, the reluctance of any really to support determined opponents of the Turks such as the Serbs, to the divisions on Byzantium just before the fall of Constantinople, to the military skills, methods of rule, tolerance and efficiency on the other.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. There needs to be balance, as a reasoned case can be made both ways. There should not be just a list of reasons, but those who prioritise their reasoning and make a strong case for one or two key points deserve some credit. There is a case for arguing they had an easy ride given the lack of a coherent opposition, but the better argument will almost certainly have a focus on the range of 'plus' points on the Ottoman side.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 39	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

35 How far were the problems facing the Valois monarchy in France during this period self-inflicted?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. There should be identification of problems, which range from the military, relations with Burgundy and England to the financial. Charles V had a limited inheritance, but there was real competence there – but an early death was not his fault! Charles VI obviously had many failings, ranging from his dealings with Burgundy, the English and the disaster of 1420. A case could be made each way with Charles VII, with his treatment of the Maid on one side and the gradual assertion of monarchical power in the latter part of his reign.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. There needs to be a good analysis of the problems facing the Valois monarchs in this period, ideally with an overview of the period as a whole, and then a closer examination of the work of the three key individuals. A clear generalised answer to the 'how far' is not easy, so answers which keep the focus on individuals are fine. 'Self-inflicted' should not cause any problems, so there is no reason why there should not be a clear case each way.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 40	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

36 What best explains the growth and development of Muscovy in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. The reasons are partly internal, with the work of individual rulers, and successes like Kulikovo. Starting from their role as collectors of tribute for the Tartars, the rulers asserted dominance over the other minor states they were to absorb. Primogeniture played a part, as did weakness and distraction of opponents, good military skills and judicious marriages. The centring of the Orthodox Church in Moscow was another useful factor.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Evaluation is looking for a clear weighing up of reasons and there should also be identification of which are the main reasons and why. The list of factors ending with the 'thus therefore we can see that...' approach should not score highly unless the final analysis is very perceptive and actually fits in with drift of the description.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 41	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

Section 8: c. 1461–c.1516

37 To what extent were the Italian city states similar in both structure and achievements?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Quite a complex question, and several of the 'heavies' such as Florence, Milan, Venice, Verona etc should be covered. A broadly thematic approach is looked for, following the points suggested in the title. Achievements should be interpreted broadly as well; more than just 'renaissance' factors are looked for. Do not insist on keeping within the narrow timescale of the suggested period.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. There should be a clear answer to 'extent', and good reasons given for both agreeing and disagreeing with the suggested thesis. Don't expect a particular structure to the answer, candidates may wish to deal with both factors together, and there is no reason why this should be any more successful than if they treat them separately. Both should be dealt with, and ideally there should be about 50:50 coverage, but if it goes to 80:20 and the former is very good, then there is no reason why they should not do well.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 42	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

38 'Just another ruler of an Italian state.' Discuss this view of the post-conciliar Popes.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. The role of the papacy within Italy as well as outside it, and also the broader spiritual role and involvement in 'politics' outside Italy could be covered, as well as factors such as the patrons of art and architecture. Issues such as ignoring the needs of wider reform and failing to learn the lessons of Hus and the Lollards could also be raised.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Quite a challenging question which needs to look broadly at the work and attainment of the papacy both within and outside of Italy. Getting over a clear picture of what the papacy did, or failed to do in the period, is looked for. The 'just another' offers tremendous scope and candidates who make a real attempt to consider the implications of the phrase should be rewarded.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 43	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

39 How successfully can it be argued that Maximilian I's greatest achievements lay in Germany?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Mere survival could be argued to be an achievement, but there are also a large range of other factors which could be considered, ranging from economic, religious, and social to political ones. The strength of the monarchy? The Turks? Italy? France? Taxation?

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. A good overview of the nature and extent of his achievements is looked for. What he attained inside Germany needs to be balanced against what he attained outside, and it could be looked at both in the long and the short term. Any candidate who demonstrates they have thought carefully about what might constitute an 'achievement' in this context should be rewarded.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 44	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

40 'Profoundly conservative rulers.' Discuss this view of Ferdinand and Isabella.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. The union itself, the idea of a federal monarchy could be seen as contrary to this view, while the joint rulership had huge implications for the Spanish monarchy. Other factors which could be considered range from the administration of the Indies, the retention of local autonomies, Granada, the treatment of Moslems to their views on the role of religion and the administration of their country.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Clearly some thinking about 'conservative' is called for, and the better candidates will debate/define this term with some care. A baseline definition and a reasoned answer, preferably with good reasons why the contrary view is wrong, are called for. This is quite a challenging question, and any candidate who shows evidence of careful thinking about 'conservative' in this context should be highly rewarded.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 45	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

41 Did Ivan III achieve more inside Muscovy than outside it?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Be prepared to interpret 'inside' and 'outside' fairly tolerantly, as several areas could conceivably apply to both. Factors such as the claim to be the founder of the Russian state, acquisition of Novgorod, defeat of the Tartars, Kiev, what happened in Poland and Lithuania as well as his attainment as far as the monarchy itself is concerned.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. A retrospective overview of the reign is looked for, with clear weighing up of the evidence each way. There could well be the argument that he attained more in the short term in one respect, but more in the longer term in another. There is ample scope for good analysis here. Any candidate who shows signs of thinking carefully about 'achievement' in this context should be highly rewarded.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 46	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

Section 9: Themes c. 1200–c.1516

42 How is the emergence of the cult of chivalry best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates are likely to refer to the development of tournaments, the idea of courtly love and the impact of poetry and song.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may argue that the initial growth in jousting and tournaments may have been to provide essential training for knights. The addition of the idea of chivalry emerged from the courtly love popular in southern France and Spain and prevalent at the court of Eleanor of Aquitaine. This owed something to the education given to aristocratic women and to the troubadours. The influence of the church can also be seen as some of the ideals of knightly behaviour echoed Christian moral tenets. It was a self-generating cult, which fed itself with poetry, story-telling and even dance. Candidates could also discuss how far from reality the cult was.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 47	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

43 Assess the reasons for developments in the visual arts in the fourteenth century.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates are likely to refer to stained glass, illuminated manuscripts and the early painters.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may argue that some technical advances helped to advance designs in glass. The patronage of the church and the nobility was vital. There were new influences coming in from the East. The treatment was simpler and more naturalistic and nature was studied closely. As literacy increased there was more demand for manuscripts and the possession of libraries became desirable. In France the growth of the University of Paris led to the development of professional lay workshops with more realistic detail. An international Gothic style emerged. Candidates may suggest that the role of those commissioning art was the crucial one.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 48	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

44 'The pre-reformation church was in need of fundamental reform.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. The range of factors which could be examined in this context is considerable such as the increasing secularisation of the church and papacy; it had become a highly politicised and wealthy organisation. The papacy had become too much of a factor in Italian politics, and there were all the issues surrounding nepotism and corruption. The curia/college of cardinals might also be considered, as could all the issues arising out of the Schism and the conciliar movement.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. There are two issues requiring debate, the first is 'extent' and there should be comment on the degree of need, and there should also be consideration of the word 'fundamental'. There could be an argument that the 'fundamentals' were sound enough, and it was just minor/peripheral issues which needed change. It is consideration of the word 'fundamental' that should separate the good from the very good.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 49	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

45 'In the short term, disastrous; in the longer term, beneficial.' Discuss this assessment of the impact of the Black Death.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the results of the Black Death in its heavy death toll and subsequent effects on the availability of labour, prices and the status of the peasantry.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates may find it hard to avoid concluding that the effects were great because they find it difficult to deny the impact of such a cataclysmic event, but better responses will attempt a balance.

Candidates may suggest that the Black Death was indeed a disaster, wiping out up to half the population and devastating those who remained. It took a long time for the population to recover to pre Black Death numbers. It had an impact on wages, prices, labour shortages and land tenure. It may have led to changing attitudes and a greater readiness among the lower classes to challenge the authority claimed by those who ruled them. A sense of insecurity pervaded society and may have led to increasing distrust of the church. Alternatively, there is an argument that the effects were relatively short lived and that economies recovered to be stronger than before. Those who died were the weak and the survivors then handed on their stronger genes to the next generation. Regional variations can be considered to illustrate the problem in making generalisations. Candidates may find they agree more with the first part of the given statement.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 50	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

46 Is 'renaissance' the most appropriate term for the artistic and cultural developments in Italy in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. There is a huge range of 'possibles' here. Candidates might go for breadth or depth and there is merit in both approaches. The better candidates should separate 'artistic' from 'cultural' and there should be sound knowledge of both for the higher marks.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. The debate is well known, and there should be a sound review of the cultural/intellectual/artistic history of Italy. There is a strong case for the 'cultural rebirth', and the 'renew' and also the views of many contemporaries to be considered. There is also the 'continuity' argument, but there is also the case for stressing much that was very novel. Was there a strong Greek influence? How great an impact did the 'roman' tradition have?

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 51	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	21

47 How far did the early Portuguese and Spanish explorers fulfil their aims in the period to 1516?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. There are a variety of possible aims, ranging from curiosity, adventure, territorial acquisition, and the evangelical/crusading ideal, gaining a Christian ally in Africa (Portugal), acquisition of geographical knowledge, the spice trade, loot, the sea route to India and its markets, settlement, slavery and simply stopping someone else getting it. Spain of course had different aims from Portugal at times. There should be coverage of both and awareness that they had different aspirations, as well as some common ground.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. The 'how far' aspect needs to be very carefully considered. It may well be that some of the aims were successful, while others less so. The best will probably adopt a fairly systematic approach, treating both Spanish and Portuguese separately, giving a clear picture of 'extent' in every case

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.