



AS History

7041/2F-The Sun King: Louis XIV, France and Europe, 1643–1715
Component 2F The Sun King, 1643–1685
Mark scheme

June 2018

Version/Stage: 1.0 Final

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer 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 associates 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 associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate 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, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

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 from aqa.org.uk

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, i.e. if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

The Sun King: Louis XIV, France and Europe, 1643–1715**Component 2F The Sun King, 1643–1685****Section A**

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining Louis XIV's patronage of art and culture in the early 1660s? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO2

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will provide a range of relevant well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or some comment on both, but lacking depth and have little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6-10**
- L1:** The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students 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 must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

In responding to this question, students may choose to address each source in turn or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

Source A: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:

Provenance and tone

- Perrault would have a good deal of knowledge of the issues as he worked for Colbert in one of the academies (The Academy of Inscriptions and Belles Lettres)
- the source is from Perrault's memoirs, written long after the event; Perrault may be giving Colbert much more credit for his prescience with the benefit of hindsight
- the tone, however, is factual and objective; it is not directly praising Louis but representing what Colbert thought.

Content and argument

- Louis did appoint Colbert to this position in 1663 and many of the things mentioned were undertaken, such as a medal to celebrate the capture of Tournai in the War of Devolution with Louis XIV as a Roman emperor
- the Louvre Palace was completed but much more emphasis was placed by Louis on Versailles against Colbert's advice
- the source implies that Colbert was the source of these initiatives; Louis XIV was usually the prime mover with Colbert as his servant. For example, Louis XIV insisted that the main focus on building work was at Versailles not the Louvre
- artists and writers were employed as stated, for example, Le Brun and Racine, for propaganda reasons. Art was used politically to support Louis XIV's desire for gloire.

Source B: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:

Provenance and tone

- Loret was a contemporary observer who recorded his views at the time
- Loret was not employed by Louis or Colbert but had to be careful as he was publishing his work at a time of state censorship and was patronized by a member of the royal family
- although the source is in the form of a poem, it is based on fact and has a clear point of view about Louis and the arts.

Content and argument

- the role of dancing is seen as a key part of Louis' encouragement of the arts, alongside sculpture and music. Certainly, dancing played a major role in Louis' court life and Louis loved dancing
- the role of Louis XIV here is central to these developments rather than Colbert who is not mentioned
- Loret emphasises the role of the dance was to improve manners and behaviour as an alternative to focus on warfare
- Loret suggests that the artists themselves had control over the academies and mentions the role of parlement in endorsing this activity. However, Louis and Colbert are seen as having ultimate control over these institutions in order to promote Louis XIV's greatness.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might argue that Perrault was employed by Colbert whereas Loret was not; this may mean that his emphasis on the role of Louis XIV himself, rather than Colbert, is more believable. Students might also argue that Loret is writing at the time whereas Perrault is recalling matters which may have led him to give too much emphasis to Colbert's prescience and planning. However, Loret is subject to censorship and his emphasis on art's cultural value obscures Louis' use of the arts to support military purposes and for direct propaganda. For example, one of the most famous images of Louis by de Gisey shows him dressed as Apollo, for his role Louis XIV dressed as a sun as early as 1653. Any supported argument will be rewarded but good answers will integrate provenance and tone with content and argument.

Section B

02 'It was involvement in war that made France difficult to govern in 1643.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students 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.

Arguments suggesting that it was involvement in war that made France difficult to govern in 1643 might include:

- warfare was causing France immense economic problems in terms of interruption of trade, destruction of crops and seizures of food by armies. Food production fell during the war
- warfare was leading to heavy taxation and problems in gathering income
- the war was being fought in alliance, mainly with Protestant countries against Catholic countries – this displeased France's Catholic majority
- the high taxes, economic problems and casualties had led to revolts which challenged the government.

Arguments challenging the view that it was involvement in war that made France difficult to govern in 1643 might include:

- France was intrinsically hard to govern because it was so decentralised – different dialects, religions, weights and measures, pays d'état with their own estates general which could determine their own taxes
- Richelieu, who was a strong and effective minister, had died in 1642. This had left a gap which Mazarin did not fill as effectively
- Richelieu had tried to centralise French government but this had made France harder to govern due to resistance from aristocrats. Louis XIII had allowed most of the aristocratic plotters to return home which was a great threat to stability
- the death of Louis XIII left a regency council to govern for a 4 year old boy for the next ten years. This caused problems of authority – for example, with Anne of Austria's successful attempts to seize control from the arrangement intended in Louis XIII's will.

Students may argue that the war did cause immense problems but this was a symptom of a wider problem – the policies of Richelieu and Louis XIII. It was their policies towards creating a strong France which had led to the war. Alternatively, students may wish to emphasise how the war had sharpened existing problems of decentralisation by its heavy demands on French resources. Students might refer to the idea of a general crisis throughout Europe due to the conflict between centralising states and feudal nobility which would argue that there were more fundamental problems than the war. Good students will tend to weigh up competing arguments against each other.

- 03** 'France's international position was greatly strengthened as a result of the War of Devolution in 1667–8.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students 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.

Arguments suggesting that France's international position was greatly strengthened as a result of the War of Devolution in 1667–8 might include:

- the newly reformed and better resourced French army had emerged with an easy military victory over the Spanish. This impressed other countries
- France gained important border territories in the Treaty of Aix la Chapelle such as Cambrai which were used to form a *pré carré*
- the Habsburgs were prepared to negotiate a partition of the Spanish empire in 1668, due partly to France's success in the war
- the Habsburg encirclement of France was weakened.

Arguments challenging the view that France's international position was greatly strengthened as a result of the War of Devolution in 1667–8 might include:

- the fear caused by Louis' aggressive use of the reformed French army was such that former friendly alliances, like the League of the Rhine, dissolved itself in 1668 and Sweden, the United Provinces and England formed a Triple Alliance against France in 1668
- French gains were limited. Louis had to relinquish Franche Comté (which had been captured in the war) partly due to this pressure
- the new border with the Spanish Netherlands was very long with many salients which thus could be attacked on three sides
- warfare always brings costs – the Portuguese were paid 2 million livres a year to fight the Spanish and the war itself cost 18 million livres; total casualties are not known but there were 4,000 casualties in the siege of Lille.

Any supported argument will be rewarded. Better students could match argument and counter argument together to form a conclusion. For example, the gains that France made in the Spanish Netherlands did leave an awkward border – but they were gains and did weaken the Habsburg encirclement. Alternatively, while the war showed that the reformed and better-resourced French army was a powerful force, its use had alienated former allies of France and left France isolated. Franche Comté was not really a loss as it had not belonged to France before the war and it was used to gain a far more important advantage. The costs of wars – compared to subsequent ones – was relatively low in terms of human and financial costs.