



# **MARKSCHEME**

**MAY 2010**

**HISTORY**

**ROUTE 1**

**Higher Level**

**Paper 3 – Medieval Europe and  
the Islamic World**

*This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.*

*It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of IB Cardiff.*

*Paper 3 markbands: The following bands provide a précis of the full markbands for Paper 3 published in the History guide (2008) on pages 77–81. They are intended to assist marking but must be used in conjunction with the full markbands found in the guide. For the attention of all examiners: if you are uncertain about the content/accuracy of a candidate’s work please contact your team leader.*

<b>0:</b>	Answers not meeting the requirements of descriptors should be awarded no marks.
<b>1–2:</b>	Answers do not meet the demands of the question and show little or no evidence of appropriate structure. There is little more than unsupported generalization.
<b>3–4:</b>	There is little understanding of the question. Historical knowledge is present but the detail is insufficient. Historical context or processes are barely understood and there are little more than poorly substantiated assertions.
<b>5–6:</b>	Answers indicate some understanding of the question but historical knowledge is limited in quality and quantity. Understanding of historical processes may be present but underdeveloped. The question is only partially addressed.
<b>7–8:</b>	The demands of the question are generally understood. Relevant, in-depth, historical knowledge is present but is unevenly applied. Knowledge is narrative or descriptive in nature. There may be limited argument that requires further substantiation. Critical commentary may be present. An attempt to place events in historical context and show an understanding of historical processes has been made. An attempt at a structured approach, either chronological or thematic has been made.
<b>9–11:</b>	Answers indicate that the question is understood but not all implications considered. Knowledge is largely accurate. Critical commentary may be present. Events are generally placed in context, and historical processes, such as comparison and contrast, are understood. There is a clear attempt at a structured approach. Focus on AO1, AO2 and AO4. Responses that simply summarize the views of historians cannot reach the top of this markband.
<b>12–14:</b>	Answers are clearly focused on the demands of the question. Relevant, in-depth knowledge is applied as evidence, and analysis or critical commentary are used to indicate some in-depth understanding, but it is not consistent throughout. Events are placed in context and there is sound understanding of historical processes and comparison and contrast. Evaluation of different approaches may be used to substantiate arguments presented. Synthesis is present but not always consistently integrated. Focus on AO3 and AO4.
<b>15–17:</b>	Answers are clearly structured and focused, have full awareness of the demands of the question, and if appropriate may challenge it. Accurate and detailed historical knowledge is used convincingly to support critical commentary. Historical processes such as comparison and contrast, placing events in context and evaluating different interpretations are used appropriately and effectively. Answers are well-structured and balanced and synthesis is well-developed and supported with knowledge and critical commentary.
<b>18–20:</b>	Answers are clearly focused with a high degree of the awareness of the question and may challenge it successfully. Knowledge is extensive, accurately applied and there may be a high level of conceptual ability. Evaluation of different approaches may be present as may be understanding of historical processes as well as comparison and contrast where relevant. Evaluation is integrated into the answer. The answer is well-structured and well-focused. Synthesis is highly developed.

**1. Compare and contrast the lives and works of monks and friars in medieval Europe.**

This is a broad question as there were changes in how the lives of both monks and friars developed and changed during the medieval period, therefore answers from candidates could vary considerably. The lives of both monks and friars also varied according to which order they belonged. The orders studied by most candidates will probably be Benedictine, Cluniac and Cistercian for monks, and Franciscan and Dominican for friars. Benedict of Nursia (c480–c550) built his monastery at Monte Cassino in central Italy. Previous to this, monasticism lacked order and regulation, so Benedict developed rules for his monks to follow. He intended life in his monastery to be primarily devoted to praising God, so he formulated a timetable for the different prayers which constituted the divine office. He also required humility, obedience, silence, and a little manual work, as well as chores that would enable the monastery to function smoothly. Having entered a Benedictine monastery, a monk was expected to remain in the same one until his death.

With the passage of time it was felt that monasticism needed reforming. The two main orders were the Cluniac (established in 910) and Cistercian (established in 1098). Both claimed to adhere to the original Benedictine rule, but the Cluniacs emphasized the liturgical element, and the Cistercians developed manual labour, because their houses were built in remote areas. By the time the friars were founded, many monks were also engaged in working with manuscripts and education, and important abbots had a role in both the Church and the state.

Both Franciscans and Dominicans took their names from their founders. In 1202 Francis of Assisi adopted a religious life of extreme poverty – no possessions or houses were permitted. He and his early followers travelled around depending on charity, preaching, teaching, helping the poor and the sick. As his followers reached thousands, it was felt that some order and discipline was needed. Pope Innocent III approved the Franciscan order between 1209 and 1210. Francis was ordained as a deacon, but was never ordained as a priest. He remained an itinerant preacher and missionary, even travelling as far as Egypt. He died in 1226 and was canonized in 1228. In 1245 the Franciscans were allowed property, and the friaries became an important part of the Church as the friars continued to work within the community. The Dominicans, founded by Dominic Guzman in 1216, also started as a mendicant order, not confined to a monastic building, but from the beginning they put emphasis on education, thus houses of study were introduced. The popes used Dominicans for preaching crusades, and, influenced by the work of Thomas Aquinas, they were renowned for theology and philosophy.

It can be seen from the above that both monks and friars were devoted to God and prayer, and by the mid-thirteenth century both had their houses and rules. But their differences lay within their rules and their work. Monks were generally tied to their monasteries, while friars worked with the people in their locality and as missionaries.

*If only monks or friars are addressed, the maximum mark that can be obtained is [7 marks].*

2. **“Under Innocent III, the Papacy attempted to play a larger part in both temporal and spiritual affairs than ever before or since.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Innocent III (1160–1216) was elected Pope in 1198, when the Papacy and Christianity were at a low ebb. His youth, vigour and beliefs led to a dynamic period of papal history. Candidates do not need to go into details of “before or since”, but only need to state that it was a difficult time. They should analyse his policies in relation to spiritual and temporal matters, although the boundary between them is often blurred, then give a verdict on Innocent III and the quotation.

Temporal affairs could include: improving the position of the Papacy in Rome; seeking more influence in northern Italy; attempting to stop the absorption of Sicily into the Holy Roman Empire; exerting greater control over European monarchs in relation to ecclesiastical appointments and marriage by using excommunication and interdicts (*e.g.* against King John of England and Phillip Augustus of France).

Spiritual affairs could include: trying to increase the spirituality and celibacy of the lower clergy; appointing bishops with both spiritual and administrative qualities; preaching and instigating crusades against the infidels in the Holy Land and the heretics in France; encouraging the work of Francis of Assisi and Dominic Guzman, by officially approving the Franciscans and Dominicans, and making them answerable to the Pope, not the local hierarchy; the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 resulted in 70 reforming decrees.

There is much relevant material that could be used, and marks will depend on selection, focus and analysis.

**3. Discuss the reasons for, and the results of, the rise of the Fatimids in North Africa between 909 and 969.**

The Fatimid dynasty ruled Morocco from 909 until 969, and Egypt until 1171.

Reasons could include:

- claims of Fatimid leader, Ubaidullah, of descent from Muhammad's daughter Fatima, and thus the Fatimid right to be caliphs, also Ubaidullah claimed to be Mahdi;
- attraction of Fatimid beliefs and ideology through missionary activities and dais;
- especially Abu Abdullah al-Shii who established the Fatimid state in Al-Mahgreb;
- after conquests in North Africa, the support of some Berber tribes was kept;
- decline and weakness of other Islamic groups;
- discontent in Egypt with government and administration especially in times of natural disasters, floods;
- Fatimid contact with Egyptian dissidents;
- after two failed attempts, the Fatimid army led by Jawhar (an ex-slave) led a successful invasion in 969, and restored stability;
- the capital was moved to a new city, Cairo, and al-Muizz, the Fatimid caliph, finally entered Cairo in 973.

Results could include:

- Fatimid claims to dominance within the Islamic world;
- development of Egyptian economy and administration;
- religious developments including the introduction of *sharia* law;
- Ismaili rite was the faith of the ruling elite and Berbers, but not forced on Sunni;
- there was comparative stability in Egypt but the Fatimid government faced problems in Syria and Palestine;
- weakened the rule and influence of the Abbasid Caliphate.

**4. In what ways, and with what results, did the Fatimids influence economic and commercial development in the Mediterranean and Red Sea areas?**

Candidates may address ways and results together, although better candidates will do so separately. Mark as a whole, as what some may consider a “way”, others will legitimately include in “results”. Candidates with balance and clear focus on ways and results will score more highly than those who write a general narrative or descriptive answer.

“Ways” could include: the Fatimid conquest of Egypt and control of at least the coastal areas of Palestine and Syria, which, with the help of the Fatimid navy, provided an area for the development of trade; the decline of the Abbasid caliphate and Baghdad meant that much of the oriental trade was diverted from the Persian/Arabian Gulf to the Red Sea; the Fatimids protected pilgrims at Mecca, which became a commercial centre as well as a place of pilgrimage; Fatimid currency (gold dinars) was very strong; the relative stability and administration of Egypt encouraged immigration of traders, *etc.*; Egyptian agriculture and industry, especially textiles, flourished because of the demand for its products; Egypt became centre of gold trade from Trans-Saharan Africa along the Nile valley.

“Results” could include: the richness and importance of Egypt, especially Cairo with its magnificent Fatimid court; the effect on Fatimid caliphate, and its influence in the Islamic world; the continued expansion of Egyptian agriculture and industry; the importance of Mediterranean ports, *e.g.* Tripoli; the development of trade between the eastern Mediterranean and Western Europe (which was now richer) in luxury items; the continuing decline of Abbasids and Baghdad.

**5. For what reasons, and with what success, did Henry I (1100–1135) develop the royal administration in England?**

Henry I was the youngest son of William I. His elder brothers, Robert and William II, ruled Normandy and England respectively after the death of their father, while Henry was left landless. He seized the throne on the death of William II and later seized Normandy from Robert.

“Reasons” could include: to weaken the baronage and stop baronial revolts; to improve law, order and peace after the reign of William II which had been disturbed by baronial revolts and border problems with Wales and Scotland; to obtain money to enable him to maintain and enlarge English possessions in France; to continue the work of his father.

“With what success” could include: the institution of the Exchequer, under the Chancellor Roger Bishop of Salisbury, which brought local agents (sheriffs had to appear before the Exchequer twice a year to account for their financial transactions) under its control, thus the royal revenue was increased; improvement and extension of royal justice under the Curia Regis and the Justiciar, although local courts continued there was some reorganization, more crimes had to be heard in the Curia Regis, and itinerant justices travelled the country to oversee justice; writs and some other Anglo-Saxon practices were revived; royal administrators, both lay and clerical, were chosen for their abilities; this was the beginning of bureaucratic government, which was continued and further developed by Henry II.

For a final verdict on success or failure, Henry I was considered to be avaricious, harsh and an opportunist, but the Peterborough Chronicle, not usually favourable to Norman rulers, said he was “a good man, held in awe, who made peace for man and beast”. On the other hand, when he died the oath sworn to accept his daughter Matilda as queen was ignored and civil war followed.

**6. Analyse the reasons why Philip II (1180–1223) was able to establish France as a major power in medieval Europe.**

Philip II was king of France from the age of 15, from 1180 until 1223. Philip was a wily politician rather than a military leader, and by the end of his reign, “the Capetian dynasty was solidly established, and France founded” (Luchaire).

Reasons could include: Philip was able to build on the accomplishments of Louis VI and Louis VII; Philip was an astute politician, and, for example, used the patricide conflict in the Angevin family to obtain parts of the Angevin inheritance; by 1223, the royal demesne was increased fourfold, from the English, by forfeiture of contumacious vassals, political duplicity and arranged marriages; the beginning of a centralized, bureaucratic state was instituted, and administered by members of the bourgeoisie and lower nobility, who were paid a salary; the financial administration was improved; Paris was accepted as the capital city; Philip’s rights began to change from the rights of a feudal suzerain to those of a sovereign, which weakened the feudal structure, as did the change from personal obligation to monetary payments.



**7. Why did *either* Christians take part in the Crusades *or* Muslims take part in jihad between 1095 and 1291?**

The dates 1095–1291 refer to the period from calling of the First Crusade to the fall of Acre. Many reasons changed throughout this long period, and candidates, especially those studying European history, will probably concentrate on the earlier Crusades. However those studying Islamic history may focus more on a slightly later period.

Many of the reasons for taking part in a Crusade or jihad, were similar for Christians and Muslims.

Reasons may include but not be limited to:

- Religious reasons – to serve God, go on a pilgrimage, obtain an indulgence, get to heaven, fulfil a vow, follow the call of a religious leader. The Seljuks had threatened the Byzantine Empire for some time, and when they captured Jerusalem in 1072, pilgrimage routes were difficult. There had been a religious revival in Western Europe emanating from Cluny;
- To fight the infidels, visit holy places, capture or recapture holy places;
- Political reasons were complex, especially with the later Crusades, and with both Muslim and Christian participants. Frequently both made decisions and alliances that were personal and political. Originally political motives for Christians were to help the Byzantine Empire and to obtain land, a principality, and become a ruler. The Islamic world was far from united during the period between 1095 and 1291, and different sects and caliphs sought to maintain or enhance their positions;
- Economic reasons, lack of prospects at home, making fighting a career, trade – cities such as Venice and Genoa sought to profit, wealth including plunder;
- For travel, knowledge, excitement, even sheer adventure.

Candidates should include specific examples of the above, naming well-known instigators of Crusades and crusaders or jihad fighters, such as Pope Urban II, Bishop Adhémar, Peter the Hermit, Richard I, Zengi, Nur al-Din and Salah al-Din (Saladin), as well as their motives.

8. **Evaluate the role of *one* of the following in the Crusades: Godfrey de Bouillon; Bohemond I of Antioch; Salah al-Din (Saladin).**

“Evaluate the role” could cover the aims and motives of the chosen crusader/jihadist; the actual parts they played in the Crusades; their successes and failures, and personal outcomes.

**Godfrey de Bouillon**

Godfrey de Bouillon (c1060–1100) was a prominent leader of the First Crusade, and financed a large part of it. He distinguished himself in the Siege of Jerusalem and Battle of Ascalon. His victories helped the Christian hold over Palestine. He was elected Advocate of the Holy Sepulchre and as King of Jerusalem.

**Bohemond I of Antioch**

Bohemond I of Antioch (1056–1111), a Norman, was the eldest son of Robert Guiscard. He fought for his father against the Byzantine Emperor Alexius I Comnenus, but joined the First Crusade after his father’s death, and played a prominent part in the capture of Antioch where he established himself as ruler. He was later captured, and imprisoned for two years. In 1107 he led an expedition against the Byzantine Empire but was defeated.

**Salah al- Din (Saladin)**

Salah al-Din (1136–1193) worked for Nur al-Din, especially in overthrowing the Fatimids in Egypt. On the death of Nur al-Din he proclaimed himself Sultan of Egypt and Syria. He then became the leading Islamic jihad fighter against the crusaders. He won the Battle of Hatin in 1187 and recaptured Jerusalem for Islam. Further victories followed, but the Third Crusade was called. In 1191 Acre was recaptured by the Christians, who were not, however, strong enough to retake Jerusalem. When Salah al-Din lost the Battle of Arsuf in 1191, he met Richard I and agreed to the Peace of Ramla in 1192. He died the following year.

**9. To what extent was the rise of the Mongols due to Genghis Khan?**

Candidates need to examine the qualities of character and leadership of Genghis Khan, as well as his achievements, to see how these led to the rise of the Mongols as a successful warrior people, before outlining other reasons for the rise of the Mongols.

Genghis Khan (1162–1227), originally called Temujin, was born in Deligun Bulduk and succeeded his father as a tribal leader at the age of 13. He struggled for several years against other tribes, but emerged successfully, and in 1206 an assembly of all the tribes proclaimed him Genghis Khan, universal ruler. From 1211, in several campaigns, he and his followers conquered North China, the Kara-Chitai Empire, the Empire of Khwarazm. When he died the Mongol Empire stretched all the way from the Black Sea to the Pacific Ocean.

Genghis Khan was responsible for the rise of the Mongols due to his subjection of the Steppe Tribes and his conquests. His character and talents, which enabled him to become leader and successfully embark upon conquests, included: a dynamic leadership, which inspired his followers; a genius for organization; his adaptability and willingness to learn from others. For example, he employed a Chinese prince to establish a system of administration and taxation, which later helped in his conquest of China. He was a master of fighting methods – the Mongols’ splendid horsemen and archers moved at speed – and strategy, including espionage.

To a great extent the rise of the Mongols was due to the dynamic and intelligent leadership of Genghis Khan. However, other factors included the weakness and disunity of the states the Mongols conquered, many of which were suffering economic decline and disputed leadership.

**10. Analyse the effects of the Mongols’ eventual assimilation into Islam.**

Although some Mongols had been converted to Islam earlier, many Christians hoped that the Mongols would accept Christianity. However, when the Buddhist Mahmud converted to Islam in 1295, he also compelled his nobles to convert.

Some of the effects were:

- Islam became the official religion of the Mongols;
- members of other religions such as Christianity, Judaism and Buddhism were persecuted, whereas in the past, the Mongols had been tolerant of other religions;
- Ghazan favoured Islamic learning and patronized Islamic scholars such as the physician Rashid al-Din;
- Oljeitu favoured Shiite theologians, but continued fighting in Persia;
- foreign policies changed little, and fighting between Muslims continued in the Islamic world. Ghazan continued to fight the Mamluks for control of Persia;
- conversion for many Mongols was superficial. After listening to a lengthy religious debate, one of Oljeitu’s generals demanded a return to the laws and customs of Genghis Khan;
- conversion to Islam helped Mongol assimilation into Islamic Iran, and the military elite developed closer relations with the settled population. Mongol society was moving away from its nomadic origins.

**11. Compare and contrast the Almoravids (1061–1147) and the Almohads (1147–1269).**

The Almoravids were a Berber dynasty that originated in North Africa, where they were dominant between 1061 and 1145. They went to Spain in 1086, where they represented an extreme Islamic sect. The sect founder, Abu Bakr, founded Marrakesh in 1070, and his cousin Yusuf ibn Tashfin conquered North-West Africa, then invaded Spain. In 1086 his army defeated Alfonso VI of Leon. In 1088 he returned and captured much of southern Spain, but failed to overcome Alfonso VI or take Toledo. The Almoravids brought confusion, cultural stagnation and persecution to Christians, Jews and liberal Muslims in Spain. In 1145 the dynasty was defeated and ousted from Spain by another Berber dynasty: the Almohads.

The Almohads were a Berber dynasty that originated in the Atlas Mountains (c1121). The founder Ibn Tumart claimed to be Mahdi, whose coming was foretold by Muhammad, and he preached an extreme puritanical form of Islam. His successor Abd al-Mumin seized all of North Africa, followed by southern Spain from the Almoravids in 1145. The Almohad Empire was an important Mediterranean power. A centrally directed administration with a professional civil service collected taxes and maintained a large army and fleet. The Almohads were a cultured dynasty, with impressive architecture and they patronized scholars such as Averroes. They were defeated in Spain in 1212 at the Batalla de las Navas de Tolosa, and left Spain. The dynasty survived in Marrakesh until 1269.

For comparison: both were Berber dynasties from North Africa, who used force to conquer southern Spain, but their dynasties were short-lived, and they were ousted from Spain. Both were extreme Muslim sects. Both alienated and persecuted Christians and Jews and widened the gap with non-Islamic faiths. Both may have inspired greater antagonism by Christians towards Muslims as witnessed in the Crusades and *Reconquista*.

In contrast, the Almoravids were disorganized and uncultured. The Almohads were cultured and patronized scholars, had fine architecture, and a central administration.

Candidates should present their responses in the appropriate compare and contrast format.

*If only the Almoravids or the Almohads are addressed, the maximum mark that can be obtained is [7 marks].*

**12. “Fifteenth century Spain is best described as a Hispano-Arab society.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Candidates will probably answer this question by addressing the mixture of Spanish and Arabic elements in Spain in the fifteenth century. The question lends itself to a thematic approach.

In the fifteenth century the Iberian Peninsula was divided into three Christian states: Castile, Aragon and Portugal. Granada was the only remaining Muslim state, and the Muslim position was therefore much weaker than in previous centuries. The medieval line of kings ended in Aragon in 1410 and problems over succession followed. The Compromise of Caspe in 1412 placed a junior branch of the Castilian house of Trastamara on the throne of Aragon. It appeared that marriage between the two branches would unite Aragon and Castile. Spurred on by the expansionist policies of Louis XI of France, but opposed by many nobles, the two countries were united by the marriage of Ferdinand of Aragon and Isabella of Castile in 1469. This strengthened the Hispanic Christian element. The *Reconquista* was renewed in 1488 and completed with the capture of Granada in 1492. However, an Arab revolt led by North Africa was feared, and many Muslims either left or were driven out because of the religious situation. By the end of the fifteenth century Spain was a Hispanic Christian country, but Muslim influence remained.

There had probably been more tolerance in the parts of Spain ruled by Muslims, and Spain was regarded as the country where ideas of both Muslims and Christians were mutually exchanged. Although this was ended with the *Reconquista*, when both Arabs and Jews were either converted or persecuted, some secretly retained their former religion. Socially and culturally Arab influence was strong and important throughout the fifteenth century. Arabic learning excelled in many areas, especially in mathematics, *e.g.* the work of Euclid, and medicine, with the medical knowledge of Aristotle, Galen and Hippocrates. Greek, Persian and Indian science spread from Arabic Spain into Western Europe. Many Roman and Greek texts were preserved and spread because of the Arabs in Spain. Agriculture, where the advanced and successful Arab practices remained, was also very important. Arab cartography and Ptolemy’s astronomy were also significant. The decimal point and the astrolabe came to Europe through Islamic Spain. The Castilian/Spanish language incorporated many Arabic words, and art, architecture and music often incorporated both cultures.

This question offers a wide variety of material and different approaches. Do not expect all of the above. Candidates will probably agree with the quotation, but could point out that it was less a Hispano-Arab society, especially at the end of the century, than in previous centuries.

**13. Analyse the successes and failures of Emperor Frederick II in Imperial Italy and Sicily between 1220 and 1250.**

Frederick II was crowned King of the Germans in 1215 and of the Holy Roman Empire in 1220. To a great extent his reign was dominated by a power struggle with the Papacy, but this is only relevant for this question in relation to its effects in Italy and Sicily.

The Norman kingdom of Sicily was the least complicated part of Frederick's vast inheritance, as technically it was not part of the Empire. His childhood was largely spent there, and it could also be said to be where his rule was most successful. Sicily was rich, and its taxes and profits of royal monopolies of silk and corn paid for his endless wars, many of them fought by Sicilian Muslim mercenaries. Frederick sought to restore the strong authoritarian tradition of the Norman kings of Sicily, which meant five years of fighting German barons and Muslim emirs who had usurped royal authority. Royal authority was restored, and Frederick's imperium, harking back to the Roman Empire concentrated on peace and justice. Sicily was the meeting place of Greek, Arab and Western civilisations, and his court encouraged scholars, writers and artists. He founded the University of Naples, and encouraged leading lawyers to teach there. Frederick's own preference was for metaphysics and astrology. He was a keen observer of nature, secular and sceptical. He was regarded with awe and wonder, but also with fear, in his kingdom of Sicily.

Imperial Italy was much more difficult for Frederick to control. He was opposed in his efforts to reassert imperial control by both the Papacy and the Lombard city communes, where many had taken advantage of the imperial weakness before Frederick, to extend their control to areas around them. Frederick could not reach Lombardy without crossing lands which were part of the papal patrimony, except by sea. Frederick's policy was to prevent an alliance between the Papacy and the Lombards. His diplomacy included promising to lead a crusade, but he was excommunicated when he failed to leave on his promised date in 1227 (he departed on a Crusade in spite of this when he was ready).

Frederick was later unable to prevent a combined opposition of the Papacy and Lombards. Frederick defeated Milan at Cortenuova in 1237, but failed to take Brescia in 1239. Time was against the Emperor. Sicily was drained and he could no longer obtain resources from his German imperial possessions when the Mongols attacked Germany's eastern frontier. His army was defeated outside Parma, and he died, still fighting, at Fiorentino, in central Italy in 1250.

Candidates should analyse some of the above in order to reach a conclusion on the successes and failures of Frederick's rule in Imperial Italy and Sicily.

**14. Discuss the impact of King John's reign on England between 1199 and 1216.**

John, the youngest son of Henry II and Eleanor of Aquitaine, was born in 1167, and succeeded his brother Richard I, thus supplanting Prince Arthur of Brittany. It was a troubled inheritance exacerbated by the continental situation and his personality.

The main areas to analyse for their impact are:

- financial problems, due to the expense of Richard's Crusade and ransom, the expense of defending continental dominions against Philip II of France, and inflation. John increased taxation, ruthlessly exploiting royal rights which led to unpopularity and opposition;
- the loss of the royal lands in France; Normandy was lost in 1204, followed by Anjou, Maine and Brittany. John did little to recover these dominions until his alliance with Emperor Otto IV in 1213, but Otto was defeated at Bouvines in 1214;
- quarrels with the Papacy, especially Innocent III, who refused to accept John's nominee as Archbishop of Canterbury and appointed Stephen Langton. This led to John's excommunication and the placing of England under interdict. John continued to collect clerical revenues and kept them. Increasing baronial discontent caused John to seek reconciliation with the Pope. England was declared a papal fief;
- baronial complaints and threats continued. Archbishop Langton sought to reconcile the king and disaffected barons. The result was Magna Carta in 1215, which attempted to lay down some recognized and fundamental principles for the government of England, and included some of John's administrative reforms. It was signed but repudiated by the king;
- Civil War – John's rejection of Magna Carta caused the rebellious barons to invite Louis, son of Philip II to lead them. Louis landed, and civil war ensued. The intervention of Louis gained some support for John, but he died in 1216. His son Henry was proclaimed king, and Louis was defeated.

Candidates should use some of the above to decide the impact of John's reign. It was turbulent, but not disastrous, with some lasting benefit from John's administrative reforms and the, perhaps overemphasized, importance of Magna Carta. The pros and cons of the loss of lands in France could be analysed. Henry III's reign could be mentioned in the conclusion, but is not a demand of the question.

**15. Why, and with what results, was the English monarchy plagued by succession crises in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries?**

During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, England was plagued by a series of succession crises and there was rarely an instance of an adult, direct son and heir succeeding to the English throne. Some of the reasons for, and results of, the succession crises in England are noted below.

Failure to leave a son and heir of an age ready to succeed: Edward II was imprisoned in 1326 and probably murdered in 1327, when he was succeeded by his 15-year-old son, Edward III. Minor power remained in the hands of his mother and Roger Mortimer, and problems remained with their continuing unpopularity until 1330, when Edward had Mortimer arrested and began his personal rule. Edward's eldest son, the popular and successful Edward the Black Prince predeceased him, so he was succeeded by his grandson Richard II, aged 10. When Henry V died in 1422, he was succeeded by his son, Henry VI, aged nine months. Henry VI's son, Edward died in the Battle of Tewksbury, aged 18. Edward IV's heir was 12 years old when his father died, enabling his uncle Richard III to replace him in 1483, but his young and only son died the following year. The succession crises often resulted in weak rule, financial problems and trouble with France, but there were also periods of peace and development.

Personal defects or difficulties faced by some of the monarchs in ruling: Edward II, Richard II and Henry VI come into this category, and Richard III, who might have been an able ruler, was weakened by his dubious claim to the throne, as he was accused of murdering his nephews. The result in the fifteenth century was the growth of two factions and the Wars of the Roses. The ambition of various nobles, some with royal blood, was also connected to this. For example, Edward III's five sons started dynasties, and the two main factions, York and Lancaster, were responsible for succession crises, struggles and civil war.

Candidates will probably vary in their overall judgement of the results of the crises. Did they weaken the monarchy or pave the way for stronger royal government in the sixteenth century?



**16. “Although a rebel in his youth, Louis XI (1461–1483) laid the basis for an absolute monarchy in France.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Louis XI was born in 1423 and was King of France from 1461 to 1483. The first part of the question refers to his plotting against his father, Charles VII, for which he was exiled. A brief explanation of the difficult situation in France, *e.g.* the Hundred Years War, (which Charles VII ended) and relations with Burgundy is required.

When Louis inherited the throne in 1461, he at once began to try to strengthen the powers of the monarchy. He imposed new taxes, dismissed his father’s ministers and sought to curb the powers of the nobility. This resulted in nobles forming a coalition against him, led by Charles the Bold Duke of Burgundy, and including Louis’ brother Charles, who fought the War of the Public Weal. The Battle of Monthlhéry in 1465 was indecisive, but Louis was able to restore royal authority after Charles the Bold was defeated and killed by the Swiss in 1477. Louis pursued a successful policy of territorial acquisition and centralization, and by 1483, only Brittany remained largely independent. However, although Louis can be credited with establishing a firm government, he left a difficult legacy for his son, Charles VIII, who inherited the throne aged 13.

Candidates are not expected to address Charles’ reign, but should be aware of this in analysing to what extent Louis laid the basis for an absolute monarchy in France.

**17. Examine the reasons for, and the effects of, *one* popular insurrection in fourteenth century Europe.**

Candidates have to choose which popular insurrection they address. Only the Peasants’ Revolt in England in 1381 is named in the guide, but other relevant insurrections would also be suitable, although not expected. The reasons for any Western European insurrection would probably be similar to, and include at least some of the following: plague, especially the Black Death; famine; changes in the nature of lordship; the decline of serfdom; demographic changes; changes in farming practices and enclosures; and repressive legislation, for example, the Statute of Labourers in 1351 and Poll Tax in 1380 in England (and especially the stringent efforts to collect it in the early summer of 1381), increased rents, taxes or feudal dues.

Most insurrections were protests against changing socio-economic conditions, but they did little to ameliorate or alter the changes. In England the effects of the Peasants’ Revolt included: acts of violence committed by both the rebels and government forces; and promises by the young King Richard II, including cheap land, abolition of serfdom and free trade. However, the promises were not kept, although perhaps, as a result of the revolt, future governments were more cautious about taxation and interfering with forces of supply and demand. Some labour shortages continued into the fifteenth century, making this period relatively better for the poor.

**18. Assess the main features of social and economic changes in the countryside of *one* European country in the fourteenth century.**

The specific details will depend on the country chosen but some of the following, at least, would be relevant:

- famine, especially in northern Europe in the early part of the century;
- immediate and long-term effects of the Black Death;
- depopulation, loss of whole villages, and effects on rural society;
- plague's effect on the Church as a religious and social institution, when many clergy and members of religious organizations *e.g.* monks died;
- loss of agricultural land to waste land, shortage of agricultural workers;
- abandonment of the countryside;
- growth of urban areas;
- changes in lordship, decline in serfdom;
- effects on wages rather than services;
- beginning/increase of enclosures.

**19. Analyse the reasons for the success of the Ottomans as conquerors until 1566.**

The fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were successful for the Ottomans as conquerors, in both Islamic and Christian lands. The main areas captured included: Egypt; Anatolia; and the Balkans, including Byzantium, with Constantinople falling to them in 1453.

As in any series of conquests, reasons include the strengths of the conquerors and the weaknesses of their opponents.

Some points of Ottoman strength to consider:

- army was basis of success and expansion;
- military prowess and organization of the Ottomans: the devshirme, janissaries and sipahis;
- development of the navy;
- ability of sultans/leaders including: Mehmet II (1451–1481); Selim I (1512–1520); Suleiman (1520–1566);
- administration of conquered lands;
- political, diplomatic successes against, and sometimes in alliance with, Christian countries.

Weaknesses of opponents:

- disunity within both Christendom and the Islamic world;
- failure to work together; each pursued their own interests which reflected the changing nature of states, and the beginning of centralized national governments;
- the Papacy failed to revive interest in a new crusading movement;
- fall of the Mamluks in Egypt and Syria;
- long period of decline within the Byzantine Empire;
- Balkans weakened by internal feuding of various rulers;
- demographic changes as a result of the Black Death.

Candidates should explain and analyse some of the above, using specific examples as evidence to support assertions made.

**20. Evaluate Ottoman art and its contribution to *either* European *or* Islamic culture up to 1566.**

By the mid-fifteenth century, and the death of Murad II in 1451, Ottoman art was well-established, with its centre at the Sultan's court. It probably had a greater impact on the Islamic world than medieval Europe, hence candidates will probably chose to assess its contribution to Islamic culture.

Some points to consider are:

- Ottoman rulers were influenced by the art and culture of their conquered lands, in both Islam and Christendom;
- the court was the centre of patronage; sultans expended much on this;
- artists, poets, writers, scholars and calligraphers were attracted to the Ottoman court from Europe and Islam;
- textiles; court dress was rich, meaningful, impressive and important. Textiles were therefore an important part of artistic development;
- Turkish carpets were renowned throughout Europe and the Islamic world;
- Ottoman architecture was distinctive, rich and impressive. Christian churches were converted into mosques, for example, Hagia Sophia in Constantinople;
- ceramics, especially decorative tiles, were widely used;
- education was important and well-developed. Captured Christian boys were educated to work as clerks;
- calligraphy and decoration of manuscripts were developed;
- despite Islamic doctrine's disapproval of the use of silk, precious stones *etc.*, many such objects were collected by Ottoman sultans.

Overall, from the mid-fifteenth century, through to the sixteenth century, Ottoman culture was rich, impressive and important in Europe and the Islamic world. Sultans regarded themselves as equal to, or even superior to, Renaissance princes.

**21. Analyse the successes and failures of Lorenzo de Medici (1449–1492).**

Lorenzo de Medici became ruler of Florence in 1469, when his father died. In 1478 he and his brother Giuliano were the targets of a plot by a rival family, the Pazzi. Giuliano was killed, but Lorenzo survived.

The main areas to consider for his successes and failures could be:

- as ruler of Florence (1469–1492). This was a difficult position, although the Medici family was accepted as the ruling family by the time of Lorenzo, other rich families such as the Pazzi, resented this and tried to oust the Medici. Much of the Medici fortune had to be spent on keeping the Florentines content with Medici rule, magnificent court, pageants, *etc.*;
- as director of foreign policy and religion (the two were connected); to maintain Florence as a leading Italian city state, and exert influence in religious and papal affairs was difficult. Pope Sixtus IV was an enemy, Savonarola caused problems, but later Lorenzo's second son became Pope Leo X;
- as protector of the Medici family, inheritance and the Medici Bank – which suffered under Lorenzo, who had to use money to maintain his position;
- as patron of the arts and a Renaissance prince. Lorenzo was well-educated, interested in philosophy, a writer, poet, and above all a patron of writers, including Pico della Mirandola and Poliziano, and artists, including Botticelli, da Vinci and Michelangelo. He was also a collector of works of art although he could not afford to commission as many as he would have liked.

Candidates need to analyse at least some of the above to assess successes and failures in order to reach an overall conclusion.

**22. For what reasons, and with what results, were many Italian cities wealthy between 1300 and 1500?**

By the fourteenth century, the five most important cities in Italy were Venice, Milan, Florence, Rome and Naples. Other important cities included Genoa, Mantua and Rome, which was also the papal city. Italy had remained a geographical area but was not a united country, largely because of the conflicts between the two institutions, the Papacy and the Holy Roman Empire. In these conflicts, both sought alliances with/domination over important cities, which enabled the cities to remain independent entities.

Reasons could include:

- geographical location, such as ports, access to trade routes, rich agricultural areas, and their position in the centre of the Mediterranean, with access to the East and West;
- early economic development, especially trade and banking;
- cultural inheritance, from Greece, Rome, the Papacy, Byzantium and the Islamic East which meant cosmopolitan populations with commercial connections throughout Europe, the Mediterranean and the Islamic world;
- educated populations;
- the wealth generated from trade attracted and developed industries and investors who generated more wealth;
- growth and development of important families who obtained some legitimacy and/or rivalry as rulers.

Results could include:

- interest and role in the Renaissance, as patrons and collectors;
- rivalry and intercity wars, which necessitated the hiring of *condottieri*, who needed paying, hence led to cities taking over their surrounding areas;
- increase in the desire of other countries to invade, *e.g.* France and Spain;
- increase of diplomatic activities and the parts played, especially by the great trading cities, in European and Islamic affairs;
- architectural development;
- rich courts;
- support for intellectual, scholarly developments, universities, writers.

Do not expect all the above, but do expect better answers to contain specific examples from various city states as evidence to support assertions.

**23. “Exploration between 1400 and 1550 was motivated by both a search for knowledge and greed.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Most candidates will probably agree with the statement, and will perhaps mention: religious motives, such as to convert heathens; nationalism/patriotism; and the desire to bring new territories, wealth and prestige to their home country, or the country that sponsored them.

“Search for knowledge” could include:

- locate rumoured Christian populations in Africa;
- new lands, their position, description, *etc.*;
- to understand the topography and products of new lands;
- navigation, to try out new ships, navigational instruments, *etc.*;
- cartography, to prove the validity or otherwise of maps;
- to find another route to the East, India and Spice Islands especially
- the interest of scientists and intellectuals – Henry the Navigator.

“Greed” could include:

- to profit by breaking Islamic trade monopoly with the East;
- to get rich especially by bringing cargoes of spices home for sale;
- to find gold and other precious metals and gems;
- to bring back and sell, or at least use, the inhabitants of newly discovered lands;
- to find new lands on which they could settle as substantial landowners.

Specific evidence and examples must be given to support points made. More able candidates could analyse the differences between the motives of earlier and later explorers. When the knowledge of the new lands was brought home to Europe, the motivation to obtain gold increased, and with it the use of force.

**24. Compare and contrast the contribution to exploration and travel of *either two* European explorers *or two* Muslim travellers.**

Details will depend on the explorers or travellers chosen for comparison. As the guide states that candidates are not expected to compare people, events, *etc.* from both medieval Europe and the Islamic world in the same question, the question asks for either two European or two Islamic explorers or travellers to be used. However, should a candidate compare and contrast one European and one Islamic explorer, accept it.

“Contribution” implies the results or effects of the explorers’ or travellers’ exploration and travel. It could focus on the explorers themselves; their country of origin or the country supporting them; and the newly discovered or visited lands. Some areas that could be addressed, compared and contrasted are: the impact on navigation; cartography; shipbuilding; land routes; trade; new products and fashions; language and vocabulary; buildings; art; food; religion; the economy; politics; wealth; prestige; society and culture. Actual details will depend on the choice of explorers or travellers, and accurate specific details about those selected and their contribution will be expected.

---