



**General Certificate of Education  
June 2013**

**AS History 1041**

**HIS2C**

**Unit 2C**

**The Reign of Henry IV of France, 1589–1610**

**Final**

***Mark Scheme***

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

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

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2013 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

**Copyright**

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

---

## Generic Introduction for AS

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

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

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

**CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:****AS EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)**

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

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

---

June 2013

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

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

**Question 1**

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

Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to the registration of the Edict of Nantes by the Parlement of Paris. (12 marks)

*Target: AO2(a)*

**Levels Mark Scheme**

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

**Indicative content**

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

Students will need to identify and explain differences between the views of the two sources. For example:

- Source A is from a modern historian who takes a favourable and balanced view of the actions and motives of the Parlement; Source B is a trenchant contemporary view by the King himself, putting the Parlement in a very different light
- in Source A, Shennan states that 'the king recognised the need for unforced cooperation' but Source B conveys a sense of bullying and threats: 'I shall leap upon your barricades'; 'I will be obeyed'

- 
- there are many differences of tone and emphasis to illustrate the basic difference between 'cooperation' and 'obey' – such as 'reflected credit on both sides' in Source A and the many references in Source B to Henry as a soldier and man of action.

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

- these sources reflect the urgency on the King's side to push ratification through. Paris' registration was vital for the other towns
- whilst the Edict was important to peace in the light of the recent Treaty of Vervins, the Catholic League remained a source of continued conflict
- there is an acknowledgement that Henry's authority was by no means secure. This was a clear demonstration of his authority
- the decision of Paris would determine the actions of the other towns, which whilst they did notify within a year they did so according to Greengrass: 'with an ill grace'.

To address 'how far', students should also indicate some similarity between the sources. For example:

- both sources agree that 'peace in the kingdom' is 'of overriding national importance'
- both sources agree about the way Henry invited the Parlement to appear before him in the Louvre indicating the clear need for acceptance by the Parlement expressed in both sources
- both sources suggest that it took a while for the Parlement to accept – Source A 'negotiations continued for several weeks'; Source B's use of both appeal and threat before registration was accomplished.

---

**Question 1**

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

How successful was Henry IV in bringing about religious stability in France in the years 1598 to 1610? (24 marks)

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

**Levels Mark Scheme**

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

---

## Indicative content

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

Students should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. In 'how important' and 'how successful' questions, the answer could be (but does not need to be) exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Students should use the sources as evidence in their answer.

The focus of this question is a retrospective judgment of the search for religious stability seen from the standpoint of 1610. In 1598, Henry IV was trying to secure peace abroad and at home, with the Edict of Nantes as the crucial component – establishing a precarious compromise in order to bring the Wars of Religion to an end. Answers should be based on assessment of the extent to which sources suggest compromise had become accepted by the end of his reign.

Relevant material from the sources could include:

- **Source A** – shows the apparent success of the Edict because it was ratified by the Paris Parlement in 1599. Phrases such as 'reflected credit on both sides' and 'despite deep suspicions...were persuaded' carry strong implicit indications of success.
- **Source B** – could be used to support a similar view of the success of the ratification in 1599 – this time through the strength and determination of Henry IV's leadership. In this source he clearly **seems** to be winning his point though he has to revert to threats.
- **Source C** – is full of scepticism about how far the Edict gained lasting acceptance. Phrases such as 'privileged elite'; 'many of them fortified'; 'did not receive with rejoicing'; and 'faced difficulties' all suggest how deep the reservations, on both sides, continued to be.

From students' own knowledge:

Factors suggesting stability was successfully achieved by 1610 might include:

- the registration of the Edict in Paris was followed by most major cities and towns. By 1609, the last holdout town, Rouen, had come on board. This shows once again how Paris was always vital in French history and politics – Paris had been the virtual HQ of the Catholic League and winning Paris was the key to winning everywhere
- the fact that there was no more open warfare after 1598 – the Edict really did end the Wars of Religion
- the political context gave the Edict the chance to be successful, e.g. establishing peace with Spain at the Treaty of Vervins removed the dangerous direct threat of Spanish interference in France's internal religious conflicts; and the fact that Henry IV and Sully skilfully managed the economy and the relationship between the monarchy and the towns – this meant that the religious compromise was buttressed by economic prosperity and political stability.

Factors suggesting that religious stability was **not** achieved by 1610 might include:

- Henry was assassinated in 1610 by a Catholic fanatic, possibly driven by a conspiracy between Jesuits and/or enemies within the court



- the Pope angrily denounced the Edict and Church conservatives remained hostile
- resentment and suspicion from Huguenots who considered Henry IV had betrayed them was very strong before, during and after the negotiations that led to the Edict
- by 1609–1610, the Cleves-Julich Affair was leading Henry IV into war with Spain again and this may well have re-opened the Catholic-Protestant divide (it was one of the reasons why he was assassinated) – suggesting religious stability remained insecure
- religious stability removed very much under the direct authority of Henry's personal protection of Huguenot privileges. His death ended that personal protection
- according to Greengrass, despite the Edict, Huguenots remained at margins or confines of traditional French society and liable to become more vulnerable in a different regime.

Good answers may show skill in assessing the relative importance of a wide range of factors; or good understanding of links between different factors. Note that one feature of good answers may be the ability to **use** evidence about developments after 1610 to 'prove' an argument about the situation at the end of Henry IV's reign. This could indeed be done very effectively but it is not a requirement – answers can reach Level 5 purely focusing on the years from 1598 to 1610.

---

**Question 2**

**03** Explain why Henry of Navarre was proclaimed King of France in 1589. (12 marks)

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

**Levels Mark Scheme**

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

**L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

**L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**

**L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**

**L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

**Indicative content**

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

Answers should include a range of reasons behind the assassination of Henry III. (Note that the focus of the question is on explaining *why* events in 1589 turned out as they did; this may involve dealing with the consequences of the murder of the Guises late in 1588 on Henry III's orders, and of Henry III's wider problems with the Catholic League which effectively only left Henry of Navarre as a serious claimant. This is, of course, a valid approach but narrative description of 'the background' should not be over-rewarded.

Students might include some of the following longer-term factors:

- by 1589 the succession was tenuous and complicated. Both Catholics and Protestants pinned their hopes on a revival of royal authority but this needed a valid claimant
- Henry of Navarre was next in line under Salic Law, followed by uncle Charles, Cardinal de Bourbon
- under 'consanguinity' Charles took precedence, Catholics opted for 'catholicity' in favour of Charles

- 
- the joining forces of Henry III and Henry of Navarre was a military alliance which offset the power of the Catholic League but Henry III's assassination left him acknowledging Henry of Navarre as his successor
  - Henry of Navarre was proclaimed king in an attempt to provide an effective leadership and counter to the Spanish supported Catholic League
  - he was a clear leader, general and controller of an effective and successful army
  - whilst a Huguenot it was hoped that a conversion would strengthen his claim
  - the Catholic League had failed to offer a more effective and legitimate claimant.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the interrelationship of the reasons given. For example, they might analyse the relationship between Henry of Navarre and Henry III to show how everything revolved around the problem of the succession and that within the context of 1589 Henry of Navarre was seen as the only realistic claimant to restore royal authority, counter the military threat posed by the League and Spain, the alternatives were essentially ineffective.

## Question 2

- 04** 'Henry of Navarre was able to establish his authority as King of France in the years 1589 to 1594 because of the weaknesses of the Catholic League.'  
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

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

## Levels Mark Scheme

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

## Indicative content

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

The key issue is to explain how did Henry of Navarre establish his authority as King in the period 1589–1594 or was it the weaknesses of the Catholic League or other reasons?

- the Catholic League was unable to resolve its attempts to offer an effective candidate

- further complicated by offering the Crown to Phillip II and later to the Duke of Mayenne against his own nephew Charles of Guise whom the Spanish favoured
- in 1591 Mendoza's diplomatic baggage was captured and codes and cyphers taken. Navarre from that point knew all Leaguer policies
- Mayenne's failure to hold the Leaguer party together was retrieved by his ability to extract terms from Spain. Yet he delayed further in 1592 when he was 'held in division'
- in January 1593 the estates general revealed the open hostility towards Mayenne
- in April 1593 indirect negotiations were opened with Henry IV, a time followed enabling Henry to enter Paris in March 1594.

In 1589, Henry was vulnerable, threatened by the forces of the League backed by Parma's army. His attempts to renew the siege of Paris in 1590–1592 failed but by 1594 he was able to capture Paris without firing a shot. The lack of a credible Catholic claimant could indeed provide the basis for most of the answer, though it is possible that many students will focus their arguments on other factors deemed to be more important. These factors include the actions of Henry himself, especially the conversion in 1593, but also the contextual factors that weakened and divided the League.

Students should be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence that supports the view given against those which does not.

Evidence supporting the view that Henry IV was able to establish his authority because of the weaknesses of the League might include:

- the conversion earlier had strengthened Henry's position, further undermining the weaknesses of the Catholic League
- Henry of Navarre remained vulnerable throughout the years between his accession in 1589 and his conversion in 1593. The way people came round to support him after his conversion showed what an opportunity there had been to overthrow him in the years since 1589, if only there had been a viable Catholic alternative
- the first main rival claimant, the Cardinal de Bourbon, was an elderly man with little political credibility (and he was in any case virtually a prisoner of Henry of Navarre)
- after Bourbon died in 1590, efforts to unite a round a successor were apparently strengthened but actually handicapped by Spanish influence. Fears of undue Spanish control inside France made many people prefer a converted Henry of Navarre to any Spanish puppet
- the constitutional factor was important. People in the Parlement were not ready to go against the Salic Law – and that favoured Henry IV. This is proved by the dramatic impact of the speech to the Paris Parlement by Guillaume de Vair in 1593
- the League was weakened by internal divisions.

Evidence that might be used to support the view that other factors were more important than the weaknesses of the League might include:

- the Siege of Paris showed how different factions within the League fought each other and how the radicals alienated potential moderate supporters with Henry's interpretation of League intelligence help to his advantage
- the military leader of the League, Mayenne, clashed with the Sixteen (and eventually marched into Paris to arrest the ringleaders and put some of them to death)
- the League and its Spanish allies made many mistakes and missed many opportunities
- the intervention of Spain was a two-edged sword. It strengthened the League militarily but aroused patriotic concerns about possible foreign domination by Spain.

- in the same way, support for the League from the Papacy aroused fears for the independence of the Gallican Church
- Henry IV played his hand well, both as a military leader and by the skilful timing and presentation of his conversion
- Henry's conversion was instrumental in undermining the purpose of the League.

Good answers are likely to explain how various factors were interrelated, perhaps concluding for example, that although there were clear weaknesses within the Catholic League, the internal bickering over a suitable candidate, Spanish interference, the intransigence of Mayenne and the politics of the League were beginning to alienate many who saw Henry increasingly as a more credible leader. Yet Henry's actions were important, the military victories, the legitimacy of his claim, the conversion and Henry's decision to seek national unity through war.

---

**Question 3**

**05** Explain why Sully had gained great power in Henry IV's court by 1598. (12 marks)

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

**Levels Mark Scheme**

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

**Indicative content**

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

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Sully rose to prominence.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- Bethune was a Protestant, from a loyal Huguenot family who had proven his trustworthiness
- he had a long association with Henry of Navarre, having first joined his service in 1571
- he was a capable soldier and military engineer who fought many battles in the civil wars and was badly wounded at the Battle of Ivry in 1590
- he became a valued political adviser – he was one of those involved in the discussions and planning concerning Henry IV's conversion
- after the succession was secured in 1594, Bethune was lavishly rewarded with lands and titles. This influence recognised his abilities as an organiser and perceptive confidant, his energy as well as loyal service.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the interrelationship of the reasons given. For example, they might make links between Sully's personal achievements and the situation of 1598 that meant Henry IV **needed** someone like him.



---

**Question 3**

- 06** 'France's economic recovery in the years 1598 to 1610 was entirely due to Sully.'  
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

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

**Levels Mark Scheme**

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

**Indicative content**

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

Many answers will put forward arguments that Sully did indeed single-handedly put France straight after the desperate economic and financial crisis that faced the monarchy in 1598. On the other hand, there are credible alternative interpretations – Sully was not a miracle-worker and there were some failures; other people were also involved; there were important contextual factors aiding economic recovery. Any or all of these views could provide the basis for a balanced answer. (Note that the wording of the question assumes as a given that there was a

---

successful recovery. If students want to evaluate the extent to which this is so, this **could** be made relevant and effective but it is certainly not a requirement of the question.)

Factors supporting the view that Sully's contribution was all-important might include:

- Sully inherited crippling royal debts but had restored the finances by 1610. As *Surintendant des Finances* he saved tens of millions of livres between 1600 and 1610
- Sully reformed the taxation system to reduce corruption and inefficiency in tax-collecting. His introduction of the *paulette* in 1604 gave the Crown much more control over provincial governors (he played an important part in strengthening the royal authority and thus the political and religious stability that provided the context for economic recovery)
- Sully boosted agriculture through trade and land reclamation. To a lesser extent he encouraged industry, especially silks and textiles
- Sully invested in infrastructure improvements (roads, canals, bridges and so on) that revitalised towns and trade.

Evidence to support the view that other factors were more important might include:

- Sully was not a one-man band. He could only operate successfully through the authority he derived from Henry IV – and the King used other advisers as well as Sully (like Villefoi) and often took initiatives himself in promoting trade and financial entrepreneurialism
- Sully made mistakes. (Some historians claim that the *paulette* was a disaster economically, even though it consolidated royal power – and Sully was massively successful in building up his own wealth, as well as that of the Crown)
- economic recovery was all about the absence of war. Once Henry tamed the religious conflict and made peace with Spain in 1598, the way was open for the French economy to rebound naturally
- recovery was all about the revival of the towns – but this was about politics and stability not royal policies for the economy and, in this, Henry himself was more important than Sully in grand policies such as the Edict of Nantes.

Good answers may show skill and balance in differentiating between degrees of importance or of success and failure and/or they may show depth of understanding of the links between various factors which go beyond list like coverage of economic factors with simplistic links. References to finance and taxation need to show connections and relationships to wider economic factors for higher level award in order to differentiate at higher level.