

**History A**

Advanced GCE

Unit **F966/01**: Historical Themes Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1066-1715

**Mark Scheme for January 2011**

---

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2011

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622  
Facsimile: 01223 552610  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

Maximum mark 120 for this unit.

2 answers: Each maximum mark 60

	<b>A01a</b>	<b>A01b</b>
<b>IA</b>	18-20	36-40
<b>IB</b>	16-17	32-35
<b>II</b>	14-15	28-31
<b>III</b>	12-13	24-27
<b>IV</b>	10-11	20-23
<b>V</b>	8-9	16-19
<b>VI</b>	4-7	8-15
<b>VII</b>	0-3	0-7

Notes:

- (i) Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO.
- (ii) If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found.
- (iii) Many answers will not fall at the same level for each AO.
- (iv) Candidates will demonstrate synoptic skills by drawing together appropriate techniques, knowledge and understanding to evaluate developments over the whole of the period

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
Total mark for each question = 60	Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.	Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context;</li> <li>- the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied</li> </ul>
<b>Level IA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses a wide range of accurate and relevant evidence</li> <li>• Accurate and confident use of appropriate historical terminology</li> <li>• Answer is clearly structured and coherent; communicates accurately and legibly.</li> </ul> <p><b>18-20</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) relevant to analysis in their historical context</li> <li>• Excellent synthesis and synoptic assessment</li> <li>• Answer is consistently and relevantly analytical with developed explanations and supported judgements</li> <li>• May make unexpected but substantiated connections over the whole period</li> </ul> <p><b>36-40</b></p>
<b>Level IB</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses accurate and relevant evidence</li> <li>• Accurate use of a range of appropriate historical terminology</li> <li>• Answer is clearly structured and mostly coherent; communicates accurately and legibly</li> </ul> <p><b>16-17</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very good level of understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context.</li> <li>• Answer is consistently focused on the question set</li> <li>• Very good level of explanation / analysis, and provides supported judgements.</li> <li>• Very good synthesis and synoptic assessment of the whole period</li> </ul> <p><b>32-35</b></p>
<b>Level II</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses mostly accurate and relevant evidence</li> <li>• Generally accurate use of historical terminology</li> <li>• Answer is structured and mostly coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear</li> </ul> <p><b>14-15</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good level of understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context</li> <li>• Good explanation / analysis but overall judgements may be uneven</li> <li>• Answer is focused on the issues in the question set</li> <li>• Good synthesis and assessment of developments over most of the period</li> </ul> <p><b>28-31</b></p>

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
<b>Level III</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses relevant evidence but there may be some inaccuracy</li> <li>• Answer includes relevant historical terminology but this may not be extensive or always accurately used</li> <li>• Most of the answer is structured and coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear</li> </ul> <p>12-13</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shows a sound understanding of key concepts, especially continuity and change, in their historical context</li> <li>• Most of the answer is focused on the question set</li> <li>• Answers may be a mixture of analysis and explanation but also description and narrative, but there may also be some uneven overall judgements; <b>OR</b> answers may provide more consistent analysis but the quality will be uneven and its support often general or thin</li> <li>• Answer assesses relevant factors but provides only a limited synthesis of developments over most of the period</li> </ul> <p>24-27</p>
<b>Level IV</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is deployment of relevant knowledge but level / accuracy will vary</li> <li>• Some unclear and/or underdeveloped and/or disorganised sections</li> <li>• Mostly satisfactory level of communication</li> </ul> <p>10-11</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfactory understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context</li> <li>• Satisfactory focus on the question set</li> <li>• Answer may be largely descriptive / narratives of events, and links between this and analytical comments will typically be weak or unexplained</li> <li>• Makes limited synoptic judgements about developments over only part of the period</li> </ul> <p>20-23</p>
<b>Level V</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General and basic historical knowledge but also some irrelevant and inaccurate material</li> <li>• Often unclear and disorganised sections</li> <li>• Adequate level of communication but some weak prose passages</li> </ul> <p>8-9</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context</li> <li>• Some understanding of the question but answers may focus on the topic and not address the question set <b>OR</b> provides an answer based on generalisation</li> <li>• Attempts an explanation but often general coupled with assertion, description / narrative</li> <li>• Very little synthesis or analysis and only part(s) of the period will be covered</li> </ul> <p>16-19</p>

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
<b>Level VI</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of relevant evidence will be limited; there will be much irrelevance and inaccuracy</li> <li>• Answers may have little organisation or structure</li> <li>• Weak use of English and poor organisation</li> </ul> <p><b>4-7</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very little understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context</li> <li>• Limited perhaps brief explanation</li> <li>• Mainly assertion, description / narrative</li> <li>• Some understanding of the topic but not the question's requirements</li> </ul> <p><b>8-15</b></p>
<b>Level VII</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little relevant or accurate knowledge</li> <li>• Very fragmentary and disorganised response</li> <li>• Very poor use of English and some incoherence</li> </ul> <p><b>0-3</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weak understanding of key concepts (eg continuity and change) in their historical context</li> <li>• No explanation</li> <li>• Assertion, description / narrative predominate</li> <li>• Weak understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements</li> </ul> <p><b>0-7</b></p>

**English Government and the Church 1066-1216****1 Assess the view that possession of continental lands by the Crown weakened English central government in the period from 1066 to 1216. [60]**

There were a number of ways in which possession of the continental lands could have weakened English central government. Possession of Normandy and, later, of the Angevin Empire, brought the fundamental problem of how to deal with absentee kingship in an age of personal monarchy. The cost of maintaining or trying to regain the overseas lands was considerable and put a strain on the royal finances. The continental possessions were partly responsible for rebellion under Stephen and John. The English situation deteriorated while Stephen concentrated on Normandy and later, barons wanted to limit the difficulties they faced in having two overlords, a factor in the civil war under Stephen. This also created problems for John after 1204, and his attempts to raise money to campaign to recover Normandy helped to worsen relations with his barons, coming to a head in the civil war of 1215.

However, candidates might well argue that English central government was not significantly weakened by most of these things. Absentee kings led to the development of bureaucratic government which could function effectively without the king, including the office of chief justiciar which from its prototype in the time of Ranulf Flambard rose to be a great office of state under Hubert Walter who ran the country in the king's absence, and to the strengthening of the office of chancellor in the later Angevin period. The cost of maintaining or trying to regain the continental possessions was responsible for the exploitation of financial rights and justice which in turn led to much more control over royal officials such as sheriffs who had to render regular account at the Exchequer. These developments strengthened rather than weakened English government. Candidates could also argue that even rebellion in Stephen's reign did not weaken government in the long run as this, together with the continual need to meet the expenses of running his large empire, led to Henry II's increased centralisation, including his introduction of the possessory assizes which brought in extra money and enhanced royal justice. Some might also add that William I's introduction of Norman ideas, including feudalism, helped to strengthen the government of England.

Weaker responses are likely to concentrate on ways in which the overseas possessions either weakened or strengthened government, typically rejecting the view in the question. Most candidates will probably deal with both and reach a reasoned conclusion. The best candidates might well point out that, in the end, the continental possessions did help to weaken central government since the very strength of the system developed to deal with them became one of the causes of the rebellion against John, and much of it was overthrown after 1215.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

**2 To what extent did English local government change in the period from 1066 to 1216? [60]**

In some ways English local government remained the same throughout the period. The main units, the shire and the hundred, retained their courts and the sheriff remained a royal official in the shire. However, while at the beginning of the period, and again temporarily in Stephen's reign, the sheriff was a man of status in his own right, for most of the period the sheriff's role was declining in importance. At least from Henry I's reign the sheriff was required to render regular account at the Exchequer and the great inquests of sheriffs in 1170, 1194 and 1213 show the crown's determination to keep sheriffs under royal control. As his status declined so he was more involved in routine business. By contrast, itinerant justices grew in importance, being sent into the shires on general eyre, reported local information to the Exchequer and carried out various judicial duties. In the Angevin period they were used to investigate all royal officials in the shire. It is likely that weaker candidates will describe these changes, possibly adopting a chronological approach.

Better responses might well examine the increasing centralisation of local government which went on throughout the period and see the changes in the position of the sheriff and itinerant justices as examples of this. Kings were keen to extend royal control over the localities with increasingly centralised collection of finance, extension of royal justice in the shires and increasingly centralised administration.

The best responses are likely to look at examples of both change and continuity, and reach a nuanced judgement on the extent of change.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

**3 'Relations between kings and their archbishops of Canterbury grew steadily worse in the period from 1066 to 1216.' How far do you agree with this judgement? [60]**

Most candidates will probably limit their discussion to Lanfranc, Anselm, Becket and Langton as these are in the specification. It is not necessary to mention any other archbishop. However, candidates who make relevant reference to others, typically Theobald and Hubert Walter, should be given credit.

A comparison of Lanfranc's excellent relations with William I at the beginning of the period, with Langton's largely very poor relations with John at the end, suggests that there was a steady deterioration in relations between kings and archbishops of Canterbury. Lanfranc supported William's ideas on the authority of church and state and was prepared to use the church to help cement Norman rule in England. He refused the pope's summons to Rome and kept England free of Gregorian reform. William backed Lanfranc over the primacy and supported his church reforms. In contrast, John allowed the country to be put under interdict rather than accept the pope's nominee, Langton. In between these contrasting periods, Anselm's argument with William II over a range of problems from the quality of the Canterbury knights to recognition of the pope, and with Henry I over investiture, and Becket's quarrel with Henry II which dominated their relationship, could be seen as further evidence of steady worsening of relations. It is possible that weaker candidates will concentrate on these examples and illustrate the judgement in the question.

Better responses will recognise that the picture was more complex. It is arguable that relations reached their nadir with the murder of Becket which was over 40 years before the end of the period, and not even John's relations with Langton were that bad. On the other hand, candidates might point out that Henry II had not intended this. They are also likely to discuss periods of improved relations. For example, Anselm was able to reach a compromise with Henry I over investiture in 1107 which led to better relations. Henry II's relations with Canterbury improved after the death of Becket and Hubert Walter enjoyed excellent relations with Richard I. They might well conclude that, instead of a steady

decline, there was a much less consistent picture. The best responses will probably evaluate a range of evidence from across the period and reach a supported judgement. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

**4 'Political faction was the most important cause of rebellion in the Tudor period.'**  
**How far do you agree? [60]**

In assessing the relative importance of political factions as a cause of rebellions, candidates could consider rebellions such as Lincoln, Warbeck, Northumberland, Wyatt, the Northern Earls, Tyrone and Essex, which were led by or strongly supported by factions often intent on altering the English succession. Some factions that encouraged rebellions such as the Aragonese (1536) and Stuart (1569) supporters were subsidiary causes. Several political factions sought to remove royal councillors such as Morton and Bray (1497), Wolsey (1525), Cromwell, Rich and Audley (1536), Somerset (1549), Northumberland (1553) and the Cecils (1569 and 1601), though this was not always the prime aim. In Ireland, factions increasingly opposed English rule in Dublin and the O'Neill (1558), Munster (1569), Geraldine (1579) and Tyrone (1595) rebellions had political undercurrents. Better essays should compare political factions as a cause with other causes to make a relative judgement. Some may conclude that social and economic causes, especially taxation and enclosures, were more frequent and significant causes and on occasions occurred independently of factional politics eg in 1596. Several rebellions between 1536 and 1569 had religious grievances as their main cause: some of these had a strong factional undercurrent (eg Pilgrimage of Grace, Wyatt, Northern Earls, Munster); in others political factions were less important (eg Kildare, Western, Kett, Geraldine). A range of comparative assessments across the period and covering both England and Ireland is expected of the best answers before reaching a conclusion on the relative importance of political factions.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team Leader.

**5 Assess the reasons for the decline in the frequency of rebellion in England in the period from 1485 to 1603. [60]**

Most English rebellions occurred at the beginning of the Tudor period when the dynasty was very vulnerable. In Henry VII's reign there were 6 rebellions and another 4 occurred between 1509 and 1549. From 1550 to 1603 there were just 5 rebellions in England, the last major disturbance occurring in 1569-70. The main reasons that candidates are likely to offer are: the early Tudors gradually eliminated dynastic and political threats to their throne from the Yorkists, which had been particularly prevalent in the 1480s and 1490s.

Economic and social problems concerning taxation, enclosures, inflation and tenant landlord relations peaked in the 1540s under the flawed administration of Somerset. Thereafter government policies were less invasive and provocative, and measures taken by Northumberland, Mary and Elizabeth to help the poor and unemployed proved effective. Government officials after 1550, especially in the counties, led by JPs and lords lieutenant, kept a tighter grip on sources of local tension and people became more responsive to resolving grievances by peaceful means.

Religious changes caused many disturbances between 1536 and 1549 but the Elizabethan Church Settlement of 1559 satisfied most groups and a government policy of relaxed enforcement led to few rebellions thereafter. The 1569-70 rebellion was the exception to this trend and for many, religion was a cloak for political motives.

Politically important groups, especially the nobility and gentry, turned away from rebellion; if they had any grievances, they increasingly voiced them at court, in councils and in parliament.

Candidates should assess these reasons before deciding which were the most important.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team Leader.

**6 'Government strategy in dealing with rebellions in England and Ireland changed little during the Tudor period.' How far do you agree? [60]**

The strategy employed by governments in dealing with rebellions was consistent in that all Tudor monarchs consulted their advisers, gathered information and sent instructions to officials and nobles in the affected areas. However, some rulers, notably Henry VII, took a personal hand in directing affairs; others, notably Edward, Mary and Elizabeth, left much of the strategy to their privy councillors; and Henry VIII worked alongside but often independently of his principal advisers. The proficiency of each administration varied accordingly. Henry VII was very efficient, Cromwell was better than Wolsey, and Edward and Somerset had many shortcomings. Under Elizabeth central and local government officials were effective in dealing with English disturbances but handled Irish rebellions inadequately. There were also differences in how governments implemented strategies – in buying time, issuing propaganda, taking pre-emptive measures, raising troops and in deciding who should stand trial and be executed. Edward, Mary and Elizabeth were less hasty and less vindictive than Henry VIII. While most governments sought to avoid armed conflict in England, the use of armies and the imposition of martial law were common-place in Ireland. Candidates can be expected to examine how different governments dealt with rebellions, and to identify and explain examples of continuity and change over time. The best essays should assess strategies and tactics employed in England and Ireland across the period.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 7 **‘Marriage was the most important means through which the Tudors conducted their foreign policy.’ How far do you agree?** [60]

Candidates can be expected to assess a range of methods used by the Tudors in implementing their foreign policy and arguably marriage was one of the most important. Like all early modern rulers, the Tudors saw the benefits of marriage agreements which played an important part in shaping and effecting the policies of Henry VII, Henry VIII and Mary. Some marriages proved to be more significant than others – Arthur’s and Henry’s marriages to Catherine of Aragon were more influential in firming up the Anglo-Spanish alliance with the house of Trastamara in 1489 than Margaret Tudor’s marriage to James IV, which did not prevent Henry VIII from invading Scotland though it did secure Anglo-Scottish relations under Henry VII. Similarly Mary Tudor’s marriage to Philip II consolidated England’s relations with Spain and isolated France. However, marriage as a means of conducting foreign affairs was less effective under Edward VI and Elizabeth, though in each case it was a method of diplomatic negotiation and Elizabeth played the ‘marriage card’ to good effect in dealing with France and Spain. Candidates should also consider other means used by the Tudors in their foreign policy, such as political alliances and treaties, trade agreements and embargoes, the threat and declaration of war, state propaganda, diplomacy, ambassadors and overseas agents. Candidates need to focus on ‘means’ rather than ‘aims’, and a good answer should compare the influence of dynastic methods with other means evident in each of the Tudor reigns.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt they should consult their Team Leader.

- 8 **‘Spain rather than France presented a greater danger to England’s security from 1485 to 1603.’ How far do you agree?** [60]

Candidates should focus on and assess both Spain and France before reaching a conclusion. Some answers might compare the two countries thematically – perhaps in respect of military and naval threats in peacetime and at war, the support given to pretenders, claimants and English rebels, or the impact of making alliances against England. Some essays are likely to assess Spain and France separately before reaching a judgement though this approach could restrict candidates’ ability to demonstrate synoptic skills. The strong military, naval and financial power of France, its desire to recover land held by England, the long-standing rivalry and its commitment to the Catholic faith, might suggest that it posed a serious threat, and every Tudor ruler went to war against France at least once. In most cases, however, it was England that declared war on France. Better candidates might point out that there were long periods of peace and stability between the two countries eg 1492-1512, 1527-42, 1564-1603. Spain on the other hand did not present a danger for much of the period but when it did, it might well be argued that the danger was far greater than that posed by France. Until the reign of Philip II, Spain had been a useful if not always reliable ally and a counter-weight to France. Only in 1527 and briefly in the 1530s did Charles I threaten to disrupt diplomatic relations and Cromwell’s fears of a joint Franco-Spanish invasion were exaggerated. It could be argued that Mary’s marriage to Philip put England at risk and indirectly resulted in the permanent loss of Calais. From 1560, and especially after 1585, Spain presented a very serious danger which was borne out by its support for Catholic conspirators and Mary Queen of Scots, two invasions of Ireland and three attempts to invade England. Candidates may well conclude that both countries presented rather different threats, which changed over time, before deciding in favour of one of them.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

**9 Assess the impact of foreign relations on English government finances and the economy in the period from 1485 to 1603. [60]**

Candidates are likely to stress the extent to which government finances were affected by threats to national security, the cost of defence and waging wars. Henry VII's wars with France and Scotland obliged him to request forced loans and parliamentary grants, and foreign support for pretenders further weakened royal finances. Henry VIII spent lavishly on wars and diplomatic missions: £1 million in 1512-13, £400,000 in 1522-24, and £2 million in 1542-46. The Field of the Cloth of Gold cost over £100,000. Edward VI spent £1.3 million in his wars against France and Scotland, and the cost of defending Calais in the 1550s was £25,000 pa. War against Spain had a dramatic impact on government finances after 1585: the Armada cost £161,000, defences were £200,000 pa., and the total cost of war by 1603 was £3.5 million. Better essays are likely to attribute responsibility for the escalating costs, and assess how effectively different governments managed their finances. Answers should also examine economic issues, particularly trade and commerce, in the reigns of Henry VII, Mary and Elizabeth, and some candidates may reflect on England's industrial and commercial interests that were adversely affected by Henry VIII and Edward. Candidates are likely to discuss the role of the Hanse and Baltic trade links, trade from 1489 with Aragon, Castile and Denmark, in 1494 with the Levant and from 1515 with the Low Countries. The collapse of the Spanish Netherlands' woollen trade had a severe impact on England's economy in the 1550s. English merchants traded extensively with Iberia until the 1580s and the outbreak of the Dutch Revolt and Spanish war had a serious effect on Elizabethan trade. Indeed it may be argued that trade was often a casualty of worsening diplomatic relations and wars, as illustrated in 1493-6, 1503-6, 1527-8, 1563-4 and after 1572. Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

**10 'The Jesuit order was the most important institution in the development of the Catholic Church.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1492 to 1610? [60]**

Candidates are expected to assess the contribution of the Jesuits to the Catholic Reformation and to compare their achievements with other institutional reforms. Good answers will be aware of the Jesuits' unique characteristics which enabled them to be so successful in establishing seminaries, schools and university departments; in sending missionaries to India, China, Japan, Malaysia and Latin America; in befriending politically influential groups in Eastern Europe; in stemming the growth of Protestantism in southern and eastern Germany; and in setting up hospitals in Italy, Portugal and elsewhere in Europe. The Jesuits however were not totally successful and examples in England, Spain and the Netherlands might be cited. Moreover, they did not exist until 1540 so their contribution to the development of the Church must be compared with institutions that operated between 1492 and 1540, such as the Papacy, new and traditional religious orders, a Lateran council and Spanish Inquisition, and institutions after 1540 such as the Index, Council of Trent and, of course, a re-invigorated Papacy. Candidates cannot be expected to cover all of these institutions but at least offer a range of comparisons with other institutional reforms to set the Jesuits in the context of the period 1492-1610.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 11 'Paul III contributed more than any other pope to the revival of the Catholic Church.'**  
**How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1492 to 1610? [60]**

This question requires candidates to compare the work of Paul III (1534-49) to other popes in the period 1492-1610. Paul was the first sixteenth-century pope to make a sustained effort at reforming the Church – he investigated clerical abuses and encouraged Italian bishops to reform their dioceses, he recognised the Jesuits, he established the Roman Inquisition and Index, and he called the first general council of the Church for over 100 years. Each of these features could be usefully assessed in respect to their impact in the period after 1534. Candidates however also need to set Paul's work against the contributions of other popes. Among the popes most likely to be cited are: Paul IV who revised the Index and encouraged the Inquisition, Pius IV who issued the Tridentine Decrees, Pius V who reformed the Curia, Catechism, Breviary, Missal and improved Rome, Gregory XIII who refurbished Rome and encouraged Jesuit missionaries, Sixtus V who reformed the Curia, established 15 'congregations', rebuilt St Peter's and enforced episcopal residence, Clement VIII who revised the Vulgate and issued a new Index. These positive contributions in reviving the Church could be compared with the very limited progress of earlier popes such as Alexander VI who was secular-minded and corrupt, Julius II who patronised the arts and preferred war to church reform, Leo X who convened a Lateran council but was more noted as a nepotist and simoniac, and Clement VII who allowed Lutheranism to expand, papal lands to be invaded and Rome sacked. Candidates may well judge Paul III's rule to be a turning point in the revival of the Church but a sustained comparison with other popes across the period in question is needed for the top levels.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

- 12 Assess the reasons for Catholic opposition to the reform of the Roman Catholic Church in the period from 1492 to 1610. [60]**

Church reform meant different things to different people: clerical abuses, church doctrine, traditional practices, and papal power were all on the agenda, and each issue generated a degree of opposition. Candidates may reflect on some of the following reasons behind the opposition to Catholic reform:

- (1) Until 1545 there was papal anxiety about calling a general council since it might weaken their authority, as had occurred in the early 15<sup>th</sup> century.
- (2) Renaissance popes were materially minded and stood to lose political power and wealth from any reform activity.
- (3) The scale of corruption in the Church in 1492 and for much of the 16<sup>th</sup> century in most European countries was extensive; those who stood to lose from reform, especially bishops and abbots, opposed it.
- (4) Various agencies of reform, especially the Inquisition and Index, but also attempts by the state to achieve religious uniformity (eg Mary Tudor's persecution of heretics), turned many Catholics as well as Protestants against Church reform in general.
- (5) Secular powers only gave qualified support for reform eg Charles V wanted doctrine to be addressed ahead of clerical abuses and opposed a general council until this priority had been resolved. Henry VIII feared popular revolt if he persisted with Church reform in England, and there were widespread disturbances during the Edwardian Reformation.
- (6) The French monarchs were under pressure from the Gallican Church to safeguard their temporal and spiritual rights, and would not acknowledge the Tridentine Decrees. Philip II was also reluctant to implement the Decrees and had a deep suspicion of the Jesuits.

- (7) The spiritual understanding of most people remained very basic, especially in rural areas, and many preferred an unreformed Catholic Church that tolerated traditional beliefs.

The better essays will probably examine a range of reasons and explain why reform was slow to take off and patchy in its development.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

**13 To what extent were *Parlements* the main factor in limiting the power of French kings in the period from 1498 to 1610? [60]**

Candidates are likely to consider in what ways and how far *parlements* limited the power of the crown before turning to assess other factors. *Parlements* protected the legal and political rights of provincial estates from any perceived attempt by the crown to extend its power either legally, fiscally or administratively. They therefore opposed centralisation trends, challenged the crown over legal issues, and defended their right to register or reject royal edicts. Whether *parlements* deliberately set out to limit royal power or acted defensively in preserving customary practices is a matter of debate. The *Parlement of Paris* was a constant thorn in the side of French monarchs, especially Francis I, when it clashed in 1516 over the Concordat of Bologna, in 1523 over Bourbon's trial, and in 1525 over royal fiscal and religious policies. Other *parlements* (eg Rouen in 1540) could be equally obstructive. Francis invoked a *lit de justice* to overrule unfavourable judgements, and Henry II created new law courts which weakened *parlements'* authority. Strong monarchs were able to control *parlements* but weak rulers could not eg. between 1560 and 1598 *parlements* applied laws indiscriminately, especially in respect of religious toleration, and after 1598 Henry IV still faced opposition to some of his policies eg. Rouen refused to register the Edict of Nantes. Other factors that may be considered are the provincial estates and Estates-General, the nobility, the condition of the royal finances, the rise of Calvinism, and the personality and competence of French monarchs. The nobility in particular held key offices in both church and state and not only served the king but also served themselves. This was most notable in the reigns of Francis II, Charles IX and Henry III, when nobles exercised considerable political influence to the detriment of the monarchy.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

**14 'The domestic problems facing the French monarchy from 1560 to 1610 were essentially the same as those from 1498 to 1559.' How far do you agree? [60]**

Candidates are likely to suggest that there was considerable continuity across the period but take issue with the statement in respect of a few key changes. Problems that existed since 1498 may include:

- (1) The nobility who caused difficulties for the monarchy throughout the period though Francis I was able to keep them in check
- (2) Religious issues continued after 1559 but they were different and more pronounced; Calvinism could not be suppressed though its growth was contained
- (3) Finances: crown debts, indulgent court life, and maladministration continued to beset the monarchy; Francis I improved the administration, and Italian Wars ended in 1559. Henry IV after 1598 improved finances in spite of civil war legacy and recurrence of foreign wars.
- (4) Weak economy: slow transport, poor agriculture, limited state investment, all of which worsened during the civil war period; there were signs of improvement after 1598.
- (5) Separatism: regional estates and *parlements* in Brittany, Burgundy, Provence and Languedoc enjoyed privileges, customs and jurisdictions that hindered progress towards a more unitary and centralised administration.

Better candidates are likely to understand that at least two problems between 1560 and 1610 were not apparent in the earlier period.

- (1) A royal minority, female regent and weak kings – Francis II, Charles IX and Henry III - damaged the authority and respect of the monarchy which Henry IV struggled to restore. This period was in sharp contrast with the reigns of Louis XII, Francis I and Henry II
- (2) The outbreak of a long civil war and intervention by foreign sponsored armies. This was a period when many of the earlier problems facing the monarchy deepened.

Candidates should be aware of continuing problems, problems that were partially solved and problems that were unique to the period from 1560 to 1610 but do not expect each problem to be covered in detail or for all problems to be assessed.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

**15 Assess the contribution of religion to the development of the nation state in France in the period from 1498 to 1610. [60]**

Candidates should assess the impact of religion comparing it with other factors that affected the development of the nation state. Candidates may consider some of the following:

- (1) Role of monarchs as Heads of the French Church which was equivocal under Francis I, Francis II, Charles IX, Henry III and Henry IV
- (2) Impact of Sorbonne and *parlements* in defending Gallicanism and traditional beliefs and practices, and encouraging the persecution of heresy
- (3) Growth in mysticism and humanism and popularity of Huguenotism and Calvinism which both strengthened and divided the nation state
- (4) Papal relations which remained stable if uneasy for much of the period but there were moments of tension eg 1516, 1551-2, and 1561

Having considered the impact of religion, better answers should set religious issues against other developments before reaching an argued conclusion as to its relative influence. The personality and authority of the monarchs, political and administrative reforms, social, economic and cultural changes may all be considered.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

**16 To what extent was the Fronde the major factor in the development of French absolutism in the period from 1610 to 1715? [60]**

Until 1648 absolutism in France had been limited by powerful nobles, *parlements* anxious to protect the Estates and local privileges, and crown *officiers* who wavered in their loyalty. The Fronde brought these groups to the surface. Candidates could argue that as a result of the civil war (1648-53), royal absolutism increased. They may suggest that fear of anarchy produced a stronger monarchy when Louis moved his court to Versailles, which became the epitome of absolutism. Louis also saw the need to resume sole political control (accomplished after Mazarin's death), to take the army away from nobles like Condé and Turenne and place all troops under state control. The Fronde also demonstrated the need to expand the administration, suppress the *Parlement* of Paris and increase royal revenue without jeopardising the *officiers*, all of which was attempted in the years between 1653 and 1715. However, an argument can be made that other factors were more important in developing French absolutism. There was after all considerable continuity after 1653. The *grandees* remained very influential in the provinces, the *pays d'états* kept their independence, there was still resistance to tax increases and continuing self-interest among state servants, which reduced Louis' absolutism. *Intendants* were not strong enough to control the provinces, *parlements* remained a powerful body and judges retained their independence. The king moreover still relied upon small committees and a

handful of advisers. Alternative factors might include the expansion of the administration under Richelieu, military reforms due to France's entry to the Thirty Years' War, the accession of Louis XIV, the creation of Versailles. Expect a balanced assessment from the better responses.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

**17 Assess the importance of religious issues in the ascendancy of France in the period from 1610 to 1715. [60]**

Religious issues could and at times did divide French society even if most people were Catholic believers rather than practitioners. Candidates may well assess the problems caused by Huguenots in the period from 1610 to 1629, especially during the minority of Louis XIII and Richelieu's early years, and comment on the significance of Alais in France's rise to power. The consequences of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes are also worth exploring as it had an impact at several levels. Hostility and political problems caused by the Gallican Articles, Jansenism and the bull Unigenitus had repercussions for Louis XIV's authority both domestically and internationally. Louis XIV's foreign policy was also seen as pro-Catholic (fighting against the United Provinces and England) although religious issues were of less importance in shaping foreign policy in the period from 1610 to 1660. Factors other than religious issues should be considered and among these, the economy, social issues, government and administration, ministerial and royal policies, and the leadership of the two monarchs, Louis XIII and Louis XIV, are likely to be assessed. Some candidates may well conclude that developments other than religious issues were of greater importance in terms of the ascendancy of France. Weaker answers may well show little knowledge of religious issues or be confined to the Huguenots; better essays should have a good understanding of a range of religious problems across the time period and link their comments to the ascendancy of France. They will also compare religious issues with other factors.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

**18 'Richelieu made the most important contribution to the rise of France as a European power.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1610 to 1715? [60]**

The key to a good answer will rest on which factors candidates believe enabled France to become a European power and how well they evaluate Richelieu's foreign and domestic policies. Between 1624 and 1642, Richelieu laid the foundations for Mazarin's success at Westphalia and the Pyrenees when France overtook Spain as the dominant power, gained lands that secured France's borders and enabled Louis XIV to make further advances and achieve European supremacy. Richelieu's internal achievements should also be assessed: he strengthened the monarchy at the expense of the nobility, developed a more centralised administration, pacified the Huguenots, and began to build up naval bases and overseas colonies. Better candidates may point out that important changes also occurred in Louis's reign: Colbert further developed the economy, and Louvois and Le Tellier strengthened the armed forces. Louis also modified his foreign policy as events unfolded and coalitions against him were created, and it may be argued that France's ascendancy as a European power owed most to his leadership and ambition. Candidates need to compare Richelieu's achievements with the contributions of other ministers and monarchs during the period before reaching a conclusion.

Examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, they should consult their Team Leader.

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**1 Hills Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB1 2EU**

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**14 – 19 Qualifications (General)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)**

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
is a Company Limited by Guarantee  
Registered in England  
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity



**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
Head office  
Telephone: 01223 552552  
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2011