



## **General Certificate of Education**

# **AS History 1041**

## **Unit 2: HIS2C**

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

# **Mark Scheme**

*2009 examination – January series*

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

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

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

Copyright © 2009 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

---

## Generic Introduction for AS

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

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

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

## **CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**

### **AS EXAMINATION PAPERS**

#### **General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)**

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

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

---

January 2009

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

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

**Question 1**

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

Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to the rights given to Huguenots in the Edict of Nantes. (12 marks)

*Target: AO2(a)*

- L1:** Answers will **either** briefly paraphrase/describe the content of the two sources **or** identify simple comparison(s) between the sources. Skills of written communication will be weak. **0-2**
- L2:** Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources and identify some differences and/or similarities. There may be some limited own knowledge. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed. **3-6**
- L3:** Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences **and** similarities and using own knowledge to explain and evaluate these. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed. **7-9**
- L4** Responses will make a developed comparison between the views expressed in the two sources and will apply own knowledge to evaluate and to demonstrate a good contextual understanding. Answers will, for the most part, show good skills of written communication. **10-12**

**Indicative content**

Source A is a summary of some specific rights granted to the Huguenots whereas Source B examines the extent to which those rights existed in practice. Source A suggest that their right to 'garrison fortified places' was a significant concession, even if only for 8 years, and suggested that they could defend themselves against opponents if they so wished. However, Source B in contrast indicates that they were still subject to the laws of the land and had to obey the king and Source A itself qualifies this privilege with the reference to 'places of safety' which would be permitted only for 8 years.

Source B also indicates that Huguenots' assemblies/meetings could not discuss political matters. Source A, however, does suggest a strong case for Huguenots' rights in terms of toleration. This is counterbalanced in Source B which raises broader issues, particularly that the Huguenots are dependent on the good will of the crown and implies that their rights could be removed at the king's direction. Source A hints at the influence of circumstance on these arrangements, e.g. the death of Phillip II removed an important ally of the Catholic League, and so suggests that French Catholics would not have sufficient external support to challenge the Huguenots, thus avoiding any armed conflict. Source B is quite clear that Huguenots cannot break the law and particularly mentions the fact that they are not to discuss political issues.

Source B also suggests their rights could be removed/amended at any time. The differences in the sources may be explained by the fact that Source A considers the detail and Source B the broader picture.

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

How successful was the Edict of Nantes in creating religious peace in France by 1610?  
(24 marks)

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

- L1:** Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may comprise an undeveloped mixture of the two. They may contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-6**
- L2:** Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may contain a mixture of the two. They may be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the focus of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question using evidence from **both** the sources **and** own knowledge. They will provide some assessment backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

### Indicative content

Source C gives clear statement of Henry's belief that conflict between Catholics and Huguenots should cease: however, this is often seen as a political ploy rather than an expression of support for the Huguenots. His aim is viewed by most historians as one of religious unity rather than toleration. In the edict itself, there are statements critical of religious division in France and Henry viewed the edict more as an opportunity to end the fighting in the short term and bring unity in the longer term. Therefore the implication is that the Edict was not expected to be, or

---

perceived as, a permanent solution to the religious conflict but was an initial measure to generate a breathing space: this is also indicated in Source B which particularly comments on the uncertainty of the duration of the Edict and dependence on the will of the crown. Rady does not consider the issue was solved. Own knowledge could be used to indicate that even Henry VI recognised this and his own conversion to Catholicism is evidence of this. Other historians such as Knecht also see the edict as a truce which allowed a temporary peace to operate, neither side seeing it as a permanent solution to the problem, and Holt comments that the edict could be revoked quite simply by another edict registered by the parlements. However, Source A, which relates some of the terms of the edict, clearly defines some of the positive elements of the Edict, e.g. the Huguenot right to fortified places of safety even though this was only guaranteed for a limited period. Own knowledge should suggest the creation of bi-partisan chambers was also evidence of this positive approach.

However, this can be balanced or even overridden by evidence of the gradual marginalisation of Huguenots and the slow progress of the acceptance of the Edict. Own knowledge should enable candidates to argue, e.g. that the onus was on the Huguenots to prove their rights and to be guided by the royal commissioners. The lifting of restrictions on religious qualifications for the office avoided dispute but annoyed Catholics. Similarly the creation of courts to judge cases involving Protestants was implemented but had variable success with some more active than others; there were difficulties in raising adequate numbers of judges from both Catholic and Huguenot communities and the local parlements were not always willing to cooperate with their decisions. Rouen resisted until 1609. Some areas were slower than others to set the courts up. However, over time, case law grew and those Huguenots who became magistrates were able to speak with some authority in their area about particular issues.

The Edict also allowed persons of any religious persuasion to take up public office if suitably qualified; however, this took longer to be accepted. Issues of the siting of churches were also difficult and became more restricted and disputes continued into the next century; villages and towns where there was a strong Catholic population were able to hold out for years. Greengrass comments that an edict could not change people's minds and that there was a regular need for the king to intervene in disputes, e.g. giving permission for protestant churches to be sited, for example, in Calais and Abbeville. Many of these churches were, however, sited outside towns; perhaps an expression of their status overall. There were also financial issues as Huguenots had to raise funds to build their churches and there were delicate issues regarding the balance of Catholics and Huguenots in any one area and particularly on bodies such as town councils.

Disarming the Huguenots was more difficult; their safety and the maintaining of troops was allowed in the royal brevets which accompanied the Edict. Holt comments that this bought 'peace at a price', giving Henry IV space; and Henry did himself labour this point. However, there were no guarantees beyond the rule of Henry IV and this was ended by his assassination in 1610. Holt is clear that the Edict brought religious peace during Henry's reign; however, the assassination of Henry IV and the necessity of a regency indicated an end to the peace. Marie de Medici was a devout Catholic, Sully (a Huguenot) became isolated and the future therefore less secure for the Huguenots. The Edict had bought time but not solved the problem.

---

**Question 2**

- (a) Explain why Henry IV appointed Sully as his superintendent of finances in 1598.

(12 marks)

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

- 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. **0-2**
- 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**

The reason for this appointment was largely because of the financial situation and Sully's strengths as a financial administrator. The financial situation was 'desperate' (Rady), e.g. 200 million livres of debt and an income of 18 million. The current war with Spain meant that the outlook was poor. In addition there was corruption, a lack of central control and slow processes (as revealed in 'The Secrets of Finance' 1581). Money was owed to other monarchs, e.g. Elizabeth I. Henry summoned an Assembly of Notables in 1596 and attempted negotiations with Parlement; he agreed to set up an investigative body (chambre de justice) but quickly abolished it; the Council of Finance failed to resolve the problem. Sully had begun to show promise from 1594 onwards and his actions from 1596 onwards, e.g. creating more offices, taxes on salt, threatening corrupt officials with litigation until they offered non-refundable loans etc, gained him the role of head of finance by 1598.

- (b) 'Sully single-handedly brought about financial recovery of France by 1610.'  
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

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

- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

### Indicative content

Sully rapidly rose through the ranks becoming head of finance in 1598, grand voyer by 1599, master of the artillery and superintendant of fortifications, Governor of Poitou 1603, and a peer in 1606. He controlled departments of finance, supply, defence and culture. His achievements in the period up to 1610 were impressive; he was very methodical and compiled lists and detailed accounts: he investigated existing systems and developed new ones, e.g. the introduction of the paulette 1604, which provided a regular income from office holders. By 1605 there were 3.4 million livres in reserve, rising to 7 million in 1607 and around 11 to 15 million in 1610. He largely reduced the debt, often by getting creditors to accept less than they were owed, or by roundabout means, e.g. debts to England were repaid via subsidies to the Dutch. Payment of pensions and debts owed to officers were delayed as long as possible and municipal debts investigated; new taxation was established, e.g. the gabelle (indirect).

The pancarte (a tax on the sale of goods in walled towns) was less successful as it generated some opposition. The taille was reassessed and local officials were investigated for corruption. Sully supervised the king's spending and attempted some reform of tax farming but was less

successful in the latter. General expenditure was also scrutinised; under 20 million livres 1600–1604 and 30 million from 1605–1609.

However, this was not totally Sully's work. He was both encouraged and supported by Henry IV. He employed an army of officials whose functions were very closely set out. His interest in the infrastructure, e.g. roads, bridges etc, encouraging nobles into trade etc, helped to generate commerce and improve income. Rady comments that his most important move was the transfer of taxation from the Third Estate to the privileged orders.

Historians do not generally disagree about his achievements but they do differ in their views about the extent and support he had and what his most significant achievement was.

### Question 3

- (a) Explain why Marshal de Biron was a threat to the French crown in the years 1610 to 1602.

(12 marks)

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

- 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. **0-2**
- 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

The nobility generally were seen as a particular threat to the crown following the Wars of religion in the earlier 16<sup>th</sup> century. The situation was emphasised by the fact that Henry IV did not have an heir until 1601 and there was concern about the possibility of a disputed succession. Biron was specifically seen as a threat because of his negotiations with Spain and some of the French nobility to overthrow Henry IV, e.g. Bouillon, who had land in the south. Biron also held important offices as an admiral and provincial governor. His connections and influences were widespread and although he was executed, his contemporary, Bouillon renewed the conspiracy and remained a threat until his surrender in 1606.

- (b) 'The rebellion of the Croquants in 1593–1595 was a serious threat to the crown.'  
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

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

- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

### Indicative content

These were largely peasant uprising in the south west, e.g. Guyenne, Perigord, Limousin. Often as many as 40,000 were involved. They are generally seen by historians as either an attack on taxation or as a social uprising against the upper classes. The context and the issues involved suggested some threat to a relatively new monarchy seeking to establish its authority and gain support throughout France. The situation was tense, e.g. social factors were significant, for example; the trend towards re-enserfment as some of the nobility attempted to consolidate their lands in 1580s and 1590s; the population was growing rapidly and the resultant pressure on land (an economic as well as a social factor); some were deprived of access to firewood, game, fish etc, some attacks appeared to be religious or cultural; increased urbanisation was reducing the amount of land available to farm; popular revolt was a relatively normal response to changing circumstances; some landowners/peasants were faring better than others. Political issues played a part, e.g. the peasants in some cases demanded leadership from the nobility and from the king but in other places they attacked the nobles. Peasants established assemblies and asked for the right to elect representatives who could present their grievances effectively. Other factors operated in particular areas, e.g. the Duke of Mayenne was using soldiers of the Catholic League to collect subsidies and many peasants were afraid their land

would be confiscated; soldiers were being billeted without payment; taxation was heavy; landlords were shortening leases to create room for manoeuvre over rents.

On the other hand the uprisings did not spread to other parts of France, although they were an issue for some local landowners who could potentially have lost their property; popular revolt was to a degree endemic in France and a 'normal' response to changing circumstances, and not seen as a threat to the monarchy itself; some of their demands were accepted, thus defusing the situation; in some districts in 1595, troops were sent in to disperse the peasants by force: in the longer term, as Sully's reforms took hold, e.g. the building of canals to promote trade. Protection for the local industry etc there was substantial economic revival, confirmed by contemporary writers such as Oliver de Serres, which also reduced the threat.

Overall there was no real national threat, but considerable pressures on particular localities which could have caused some destabilisation if the economy had not taken an upward turn. Although some pockets of discontent remained, there were no further uprisings on this scale during the reign.