

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2015 series

9769 HISTORY

9769/21

Paper 2a (European History Outlines c. 300–c. 1516),
maximum raw mark 90

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2015 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

Section 1: c. 300–c. 632

1 'The achievements of the Emperor Constantine were strictly limited.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates could refer to the ways in which Constantine won power and united the empire, to his conversion and promulgation of Christianity, and to his building programme in Rome and Constantinople.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that Constantine's achievements were relatively short-lived, in that his empire relapsed into conflict after his death, partly because of his abundance of sons. They could add that the size of the Empire was so great that one man could not contain all the threats to its borders and so some sharing of power was necessary. Constantine had dismantled Diocletian's reforms but did not establish a permanent replacement. The view that Christianity was eventually to destabilise the Empire could be considered. Civil Wars, endemic in the later Roman Empire, continued.

Alternatively, candidates could suggest that by becoming Emperor, Constantine had achieved much and his instigation of Christianity at the heart of his government was to prove extremely long-lasting. His foundation of Constantinople as a better geographical focus for his Empire was to endure until 1453. Judged in this way, Constantine is seen as a major figure.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

2 How far was the decline of the Roman Empire in the fifth century the fault of its rulers?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates could refer to some of the Emperors such as Honorius and Valentinian and to some of their military leaders such as Stilicho and Aetius and to other factors, including the succession disputes and the advances of the barbarian tribes.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that the rulers of the Empire in the fifth century were largely undistinguished. Honorius was incapable and appointing a regent proved problematic. Valentinian killed his best general and was then assassinated by angry troops. Majorian, the most talented, was also murdered.

Alternatively, candidates could suggest that the problems in the Empire were so great that it could not be saved and the quality of the leadership was almost immaterial. The disputes over the succession, the accession of minors, incessant civil wars and the intractable advance of the Goths and Huns and Vandals meant the likely fate of Rome was clear. The execution of Stilicho, the sack of 410, the advances of Attila, the murder of Aetius, the sack of 455, the fall of Italy and the growth of barbarian sea power led to the emergence of Odovacar as the ruler of the Italian peninsula

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

3 Why was there so much dispute over doctrine in the fifth-century Church?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates could mention some of the disputes such as Arianism, the Nestorian controversy, the Monophysite controversy, Pelagianism and the heresies arising from the sack of Rome.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that the divided nature of the Church was to blame. In several cases, rivalries between Constantinople and Alexandria or Antioch worsened disputes. As the Popes strove to assert their supremacy, they were ready to condemn beliefs which were favoured by their rivals. In some cases, it was the barbarians who adhered strongly to heretical beliefs, such as Arianism, which was favoured by the Goths. Once the survival of the Church was assured, issues of doctrine took on greater importance. The relationship between Christ's divine nature and human nature proved to be most controversial. Thinkers like Pelagius, who challenged the accepted views of grace and original sin, led to some heresies emerging and the vigorous response of St Augustine continued the battle. Augustine also answered the pagans who blamed Christianity for the fall of Rome with his *De Civitate Dei*, and his cogent theory of history. Thus some individuals fanned the flames of disputes and passions were unleashed all round.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

4 How successful were the Visigoth rulers of Gaul?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates might refer to the reigns of Euric and Alaric in Gaul.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates could argue that Euric was largely successful in enforcing his authority on Gaul and defeating the Gallo-Roman nobility. He was able to define his borders and to begin the conquest of Spain. He issued a law code to define the relationship between the Visigoths and their Roman subjects.

Alternatively, Visigoth rule was divisive. The Gallo-Romans were separated from the Visigoths who were seen as inferior, and subject to heavy taxation, even though they were needed as a literate class to service the government. The Goths were Arians and had their own bishops. Alaric was a weak king and surrendered to Clovis in the end, and the Gallo-Romans generally welcomed the more barbaric Frankish ruler as their deliverer.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

5 'His ambitions as a ruler exceeded his abilities.' Assess this judgement of Justinian.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to Justinian's ambitions, notably to re-establish a united Roman Empire and to leave a lasting legacy, as well as to his abilities as a general and ruler.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that Justinian's aim were over-ambitious. His reconquest of the West and his extensive building programme both required huge financial resources. He also needed to defend his empire against Persia.

Alternatively, Justinian was a man of genuine ability. Much of the reform initiative came from him and he had a zeal for good government and sound administration. The building programme in Constantinople was a worthy priority and ensured his legacy. His interest extended to his wider lands with utilities being provided throughout his empire. He was a skilful diplomat and he promoted trade and the silk industry. He was a good judge of men in making sound appointments such as Belisarius or John of Cappadocia. His legal code also had long-lasting impact.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

Section 2: c. 632–c. 919

6 'Military successes were Pepin III's main achievement.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates could refer to the military campaigns of Pepin in Italy and on his southern boundaries, and to his alliance with the Pope and the benefits this gave him.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates could argue that the military achievements were significant. He took action against the Lombard ruler, largely at the behest of the Pope and most of his gains enriched the papal estate. He was also successful in ousting the Moslems from Gaul and thus ruled all the territory to the Mediterranean. He found the Duke of Aquitaine more of a problem and fought him for eight years, only to win the control of the duchy when Waifar died and, even so, Aquitaine retained some self-government. But Pepin could now claim to have reached the Pyrenees.

Alternatively it was his excellent relationship with the Church. As a result of his support for the papacy, the Pope sanctioned the removal of the puppet Merovingian, Childeric; and so, Pepin was elected as the first Carolingian king and anointed by Boniface. This gave him new powers and allowed him to reform the Church, notably in the removal of unworthy bishops, fresh appointments and in the calling of regular synods.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

7 How successfully did Charlemagne overcome the problems of ruling such a diverse empire?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to the conquests of Charlemagne over the Lombards, Saxons, Bavarians and Avars and the problems which ensued.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that Charlemagne was successful as he kept the loyalty of his nobles with his annual campaigns. Much of his administration was personal and his authority was enhanced by Papal support. His Coronation in 800, although the subject of varying interpretations, certainly gave him even wider prestige and control, and he insisted that his subjects take a fresh oath to him as Emperor. Aachen became his administrative and courtly centre from which his government radiated. He used churchmen and nobles to take his laws to his people and sent out the *missi dominici* as his agents.

Alternatively, he was not wholly successful. Some of his enemies, like the Saxons, were difficult to subdue and held out over a long period. He allowed himself to be drawn into war beyond the Pyrenees and the result was the disaster at Roncevalles. His own personality, rather than any system was what held the Empire together.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

8 How far does factionalism at court explain the difficulties encountered by Louis the Pious?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates might refer to the disputes about the division of the Empire between his sons, Lothar, Pepin and Louis and their cousin Bernard, and then Louis' son Charles by his second marriage.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that Louis was following the traditional Frankish custom of dividing lands between heirs and that it led to rivalries. This resulted in the discreditable death of Bernard at the instigation of his uncle and Louis' penitence and marriage to Judith of Swabia. She was determined that there should be suitable provision for her son, Charles. When this resulted in changes in the government, Lothar retreated to Italy and became the focus for malcontents. Civil War resulted and was only resolved by the forced deposition of Louis. The rule of Lothar was no more palatable and some loyalists still supported Louis; hence, he was restored. But on his death in 840, the Empire disintegrated.

Alternatively, Louis was personally to blame as he was dominated by Judith. His public penance for the death of Bernard undermined his authority and he was unable to prevent the abuse of office by the undisciplined aristocracy. His inability to retain the loyalty of his advisers and his army was another weakness. He allowed the Pope to proclaim the supremacy of Church over Empire which weakened his position. Hence, some of his more faithful supporters deserted to Lothar in the hope, unfortunately a vain one, that he would bring about unity and remove abuses.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

9 'Limited and temporary.' How accurate is this view of Viking impact on continental Europe in the ninth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to the Viking attacks on monasteries, on the coasts of Francia and in the Mediterranean.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that the attacks could be described as temporary in that when the Vikings were resisted, as in Aquitaine after 865, or Lotharingia in 891, they went elsewhere in search of easier sources of booty, their main aim. By the end of the century, Rollo led a Danish force against Charles the Simple which resulted in the establishment of the Northmen in Normandy and, hence, the lessening and cessation of raids on France. Not all mainland Europe was attacked by the Vikings. The Mediterranean was free from their raids, as it was too far for their supply lines to be maintained.

Alternatively, there was a deep impact in areas where Danish raids were concentrated and, for those suffering from raids, it seemed to be a long-lasting scourge. The Golden Age of art and learning was brought to an abrupt halt by the sacking of monasteries like Noirmoutier. The internal troubles of the Carolingian Empire meant that defences were less well maintained and so the way lay open for the invaders. They reached Rouen, ranged south to Gascony, circled Spain and raided from Cordoba to Cadiz. In 845, they famously under Ragnar Lothbrok sailed up the Seine and burned Paris. From 850 to 878, they were unchecked. On landing from their ships they would seize horses and raid inland. Some monarchs paid them to go away, but they came back for more.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

10 How far were the problems in Germany in the period 843 to 919 caused by the lack of central authority?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to the events after the settlement at Verdun in 843 between the heirs of Charlemagne, and the complex claims and counter-claims which followed.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates could argue that the rulers of Germany could not maintain any central authority because of the aristocratic factionalism. Landowning families hoped to dominate the regions in which their estates lay and needed to hold the office of count to do so. Counts could also control royal lands within their areas. Thus, nobles who lost their positions were apt to support rival claimants to the throne, in the hope that they could recover their position and power.

Alternatively, there were other explanations. The need to provide for all legitimate heirs reduced the size of the area ruled by German kings and so encouraged them to try to recoup their losses, by invading their neighbours. The Imperial title was an attraction for which rival kings vied; the Papacy almost encouraged this, as it benefited from the competition and was empowered to select the winner. In the later part of the period, the Carolingian kings were often short-lived and did not provide heirs, leading to further problems. An external cause of instability was the appearance of the Viking raiders.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

Section 3: c. 919–1099

11 'Lucky rather than able.' How justified is this view of the early Capetian kings?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates could refer to the accession of Hugh Capet in 987 and the reigns of Robert II, Henry I and Philip I.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that the Capetians were fortunate in that their lands were grouped together as one mass around Paris and Orleans. They were the largest land holders in France and their influence pervaded the main trade routes which helped to enrich them. Philip added to their lands with the conquest of the French Vexin and Bourges. They were lucky to enjoy the support of the Church which added to their prestige and revenue, and helped to maintain loyalty. Similarly, the view was taken that anointed kings who owed no fealty to an overlord should be obeyed as having divine approval; this helped the Capetians. It could be argued that they showed ability in recognising and exploiting these factors.

Alternatively, they were more characterised by ineptitude as they embarked on quarrels which drained income. Hugh and his uncle Charles had a disagreement which led to the expulsion of the Archbishop of Reims and a row with the Pope. Robert was involved in a war with Burgundy. All of them were affected by the rivalry with both the Dukes of Normandy and the Counts of Anjou, and became enemies of both; thus, their boundaries were dangerously exposed. Philip was on bad terms with the Papacy as a result of his simony, his bigamous marriage and his failure to prevent his barons from attacking Church land.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 13	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

12 How strong was the monarchy in Sicily at the death of Roger II?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to the succession and reign of Roger II, 1130–54, and to his achievements.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that Roger II left the Sicilian kingdom in a strong position. He managed to be given the title of King, taking advantage of a papal schism to be crowned in return for supporting one of the claimants. He defeated successive Popes who tried to reduce his power. He used his diplomatic skills to fend off attacks from the Emperor, making alliances with the French and winning St Bernard to his side. He also built up a navy, utilising the excellent Sicilian harbours and annexed some of the north African coast. He plundered Thebes and brought its silk weavers to Sicily much to his economic benefit.

Alternatively, Roger left Sicily dangerously exposed. It was surrounded by enemies, including malcontent nobles, who had been expelled by Roger, who was perceived to rule through low-born counsellors. The liberties of the citizens had been reduced and they were ripe for revolt. Sicily was at war with Emperor Manuel and Frederick Barbarossa, the new King of the Romans, who was threatening to invade Italy in alliance with a new and more resolute Pope. Moreover, his heir, William I, was less energetic and immersed in his harem.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 14	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

13 How responsible were the rulers of Spain and Portugal for the Reconquest in the eleventh and twelfth centuries?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to the advances of the Kings of Castile and of Aragon in the Reconquest, and to the disunity and in-fighting among the Muslims.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that the rulers played a large role. Ferdinand I in a long reign won back much of Portugal and two Muslim Emirs paid him tribute. The loot and regular revenue helped to finance further undertakings. Alfonso VI of Castile came close to suzerainty over the entire peninsula. He captured Toledo as his greatest success. Alfonso I of Aragon conquered Lisbon and, after a long reign, was recognised as the dominant power.

Alternatively, there were other factors. The disunited Muslims fought more amongst themselves than, at times, against their enemies. They were forced to beg for aid from north Africa and could not even benefit from the succession disputes which weakened Castile after 1109 and Aragon after 1185. In addition, the Christian population had increased in the Iberian peninsula and they were helped by the exploits of El Cid in Valencia, even though he was not fully trusted by Alfonso VI. His fame helped to engender some national feeling which roused the Christians to a more vigorous attitude and led to some enhancement of their military skills.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 15	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

14 Why was the dispute between Gregory VII and Henry IV so prolonged?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to the causes of the breach between Gregory VII after he became Pope in 1073 and the Emperor, such as: issues over Milan; the declaration at Worms that the Pope was deposed; the reactions of German bishops and nobles; and, Henry's submission at Canossa, and the subsequent events.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that both Gregory VII and Henry IV were personalities who did not give way easily and so this prolonged their enmity. The underlying causes of the quarrel could be seen as the result of Papal policy on lay investiture. Henry IV's appointment of a new Archbishop of Milan in 1071 infringed the papal position and Gregory excommunicated some of Henry's advisers, holding them responsible. In 1075, Gregory officially promulgated his views on lay investiture. Henry then appointed another Archbishop of Milan in defiance of this decree and the Pope considered excommunicating him. This led to the German Synod at Worms where the bishops, with support from Henry, declared the Pope was deposed. Such an action was bound to prolong the situation, especially as the anathema pronounced by the Pope caused German princes and bishops to move back to his side. They also feared Henry would become too powerful in Germany and Italy. Hence Henry, now under pressure, crossed the Alps to seek pardon in the snow at Canossa and the ban on him was lifted. This altered the political situation as the Pope was no longer as useful to the Germans in revolt against Henry. The vicissitudes of the situation led to its prolongation until Gregory was deposed by Henry, leading to a schism and the position was only resolved by Gregory's death in 1085.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 16	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

15 (Candidates offering 5b: The Crusades should not answer this question.)

What best explains the tensions between Byzantium and the West in the second half of the eleventh century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to the problems in Byzantium leading to the defeat at Manzikert in 1071 and the efforts of Alexius Comnenus to revive the fortunes of the Eastern Empire.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that the advance of the Normans into Italy and the victories of Robert Guiscard, which ended Byzantine rule in Italy, led to fear on the part of Byzantium as to where conquests would end. The situation was worsened by the defeat at Manzikert at the hands of the Turks and the loss of much of modern Turkey, which reduced the income available to the Emperors and hence increased their fears for the future at the hands of the West. The arrest and blinding of the Emperor Romanus on his return from captivity at the hands of the Turks was a further factor undermining relationships. When Alexis Comnenus seized the Empire in 1081, Byzantium became better ruled and stronger, but this only served to heighten rivalries. Robert Guiscard was eager to get control of the Mediterranean and only his death saved the Byzantines from humiliation in 1085.

Further disquiet arose with Alexius' appeal to the West for mercenaries to help him against the Turks and the Pope converted this request into a plea for a crusade. This prospect terrified Alexius as a large, ill-disciplined series of armies approached Constantinople.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 17	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

Section 4: 1085–1250

16 What best explains why Frederick Barbarossa found it so difficult to reduce the Papacy to subservience?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to Frederick's aims in Italy, his relationship with the Papacy and the resistance he met from the Lombard cities.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates could suggest that Frederick wanted to do the impossible in Italy. He began by hoping to restore good government there but came into conflict with rival powers: the Popes and the Lombard cities, and they were too much for him, given his additional concerns in Germany. When Frederick met Adrian IV and, at first, refused to lead the papal mule in procession, this demonstrated the clash of powers. A direct clash was looming when Adrian died. The ensuing schism resulted in the excommunication of Frederick by Alexander III, who eventually emerged victorious. They came to terms at Anagni and finally were reconciled in 1177. Frederick's diplomatic abilities meant the settlement was more favourable to him than it might have been.

The Italian cities also resisted fiercely, despite the consequences, as they feared complete subservience to the Emperor and loss of their independence. They especially resented Frederick taking over the provision of justice. They even abandoned their usual inter-city rivalries at times. The German states were reluctant to keep sending troops to Italy and, in 1176, the Lombards defeated Frederick and he fled to Pavia.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 18	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

17 How much stronger was the French monarchy in 1180 than in 1108?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to reigns of Louis VI and VII and the reasons for their revival of the power of France.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that the monarchy was indeed much stronger. The kings won the support of the Church as they were useful to the Papacy and so avoided the enmity which other rulers attracted. Much of the administration was in the hands of clerics and Suger, Abbot of St Denis, was the chief minister until his death in 1151. The rights of bishops were upheld. Louis VII went on Crusade and though he wavered once in his loyalty to Alexander III, he gained in respect from having the Pope as his guest. Louis VI worked tirelessly to reduce the power of rebellious barons and established an administration of professional officials who owed nothing to the nobility. He repelled an invasion from Germany with the help of a people beginning to show some sense of a national spirit, exemplified in the *Song of Roland* which probably dates from this period. He arranged the marriage of Eleanor of Aquitaine to his son, which had the prospect of great territorial gains for France. As it happened, Louis' successor, Philip II, was one of the most able of French kings.

Alternatively, there were some unsolved issues in 1180. Louis VII had divorced Eleanor, after she only gave him two daughters, and her marriage to the future Henry II was a severe threat to the integrity of France. There was the danger that French barons, hard-pressed by the feudal monarchy, might prefer the Angevin rule. But even by 1180, the Angevin Empire was not that secure and the French had already gained hope they might benefit from the quarrels in the family of Henry II.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 19	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

18 How far did the success of Philip Augustus depend on his financial and military strength?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates could refer to the reign of Philip Augustus, his successes in defeating the Angevin rulers of England and regaining French lands and his financial measures.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that by exploiting his feudal rights, Philip was able to enlarge the area he ruled directly, which in turn led to greater revenue. He established a professional bureaucracy which allowed effective record keeping and hence tax collection. He trebled his income as trade and agriculture prospered and he had an effective army of mercenaries and knights. His towns and castles were well fortified.

Alternatively, Philip had some good fortune. He gained part of Flanders by marriage and he was assisted by the errors and misfortunes of the Angevins. He was able to benefit from the feuding in Henry II's family, sheltering rebellious princes at his court. But his chief gains came in the reign of John, when all the assets which Philip had built up were brought to bear. The marriage to Isabella of Angouleme and the murder of Arthur played right into Philip's hands. He regained Normandy and most of the other Angevin lands. He defeated Otto IV, John's ally, decisively at Bouvines in 1214.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 20	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

19 Was Innocent III more successful in achieving his aims in Germany or in France?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to the pontificate of Innocent III, and to his efforts to decide the disputed succession in Germany, and his relationship with Philip Augustus.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that Innocent was not particularly successful in Germany in imposing his beliefs that popes were superior to all earthly rulers and, thus, hoping to increase his powers in this respect. His recognition of Frederick as Emperor of Germany came after years of civil war and the concomitant involvement of the Papacy in purely secular matters. Innocent supported Otto IV as his candidate as Emperor but Otto was defeated at Bouvines in 1214. Frederick II, King of Sicily, emerged as the victor and promised Innocent he would abdicate the throne of Sicily which he held by inheritance. But he did not do so, suggesting limits to Innocent's achievements.

Alternatively, although Philip II was not cowed by threats from Innocent and only gave in when it suited him, Innocent did succeed in instigating the Albigensian Crusade as part of his insistence on obedience to the Papal hierarchy. The success here was the result of French intervention and probably owed more to French barons and to beliefs that Raymond of Toulouse was a heretic, than to the direct role of Innocent.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 21	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

20 “Frederick II’s success in supporting the rights of lay rulers against the claims of the Papacy was his greatest achievement.’ Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates might refer to the aims of Frederick II and his activities in Germany and Italy, which ran counter to the policies of the popes.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates could argue that Frederick did uphold the rights of lay rulers. He was crowned by the Pope in the expectation that he would go on crusade; he managed to evade fulfilling this promise although he sent aid. He was ready to rule in partnership with Henry the Lion and left Henry in virtual control of Bavaria and Saxony, when he realised that no other better solution was possible. When he went to Sicily, he left as regent, Engelbert of Cologne, who governed successfully and defeated Danish ambitions in the Baltic. His appointment of his son Henry, the King of the Romans, as regent was less successful and led eventually to deposition, but later Frederick returned to Germany and did much to restore his power there. In 1158, he raised the Duke of Bohemia to the rank of King. In Italy, he went back on his commitment to abdicate from the throne of Sicily. He defied the Pope and proceeded to reform the government in Sicily, leading to a quarrel with the Papacy and his excommunication. The outcome was his deposition by a General Council in 1245 and much chaotic conflict in Italy and Germany.

Alternatively, he was successful in other aims, such as restoring order to a Germany beset by civil war, which no one party seemed strong enough to win. He was able to embark on a clear economic strategy. His acknowledgement of the feudal rights already granted to German noblemen and their families increased his standing. He subdued the cities of Lombardy. But much of his Italian policy was not successful in the long run and to an extent he neglected Germany once he had secured his position there.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 22	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

Section 5: Themes c. 300– c. 1200

21 What best explains the development of feudal society in the early Middle Ages?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to areas of Western Europe where feudalism was established.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that feudalism was beneficial to monarchs, who gave land to vassals which helped to ensure their loyalty and also gained troops when they needed them. Swearing fealty to a lord was a serious matter and bound men closely in their allegiance. The vassals gained too as they acquired land from which they could derive revenue. The hierarchical society implicit in feudalism with those who prayed, those who fought and those who worked had advantages all round. The Church favoured the system as a sign of orderliness in God's creation. A system which had begun as a way of binding followers to their lords in the barbarian tribes was extended to Western European monarchies. It was brought to England by William of Normandy and the areas of Europe where there was Norman influence were largely feudal.

The feudal bond allowed lords to call up knights in times of war without the need to pay them in its initial stages and later the exaction of scutage provided the revenue to hire mercenaries. It also reflected the fact that war was the main preoccupation of the lordly classes, again showing the influence of barbarian customs.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 23	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

22 How important were commercial factors in the growth of towns in the tenth and eleventh centuries?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates could refer to a range of examples across Europe and should go beyond one country.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that the development of trade was a key factor in the growth of towns. The merchant class had very diverse origins and some merchants probably had agrarian interests as well, since the separation of trade and agriculture belongs more to the later period. Men of enterprise who were ready to risk their money and their lives on trading ventures became more numerous, and were helped by advances in shipbuilding. The establishment of a market often led to the growth of a town. Later, some were helped by the establishment of a Jewish community which could provide loans.

There were other factors. Some towns were more for defensive reasons, although markets prospered better in towns which had walls, so the factors are intertwined. Towns developed as centres of pilgrimage, notably Rome, and as capital cities for rulers in church and state. Some became known for attracting artists or scholars. Royal courts also helped towns to develop as monarchies were still peripatetic. Some were developing as army bases or as a safe haven for naval forces.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 24	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

23 ‘The new orders were the driving force behind monastic reform in the tenth and eleventh centuries.’ Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates could refer to the establishment and growth of the monasteries at Cluny and Gorze, the Augustinian canons, the Carthusians and the Camoldenses.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates might argue that the new orders were largely attempts to restore the purity of the Rule of St Benedict. They attempted to separate laity from the professed and to ensure monks were truly cut off from the outside world. They demanded greater simplicity, less splendour and harder manual labour. Their houses were situated in remoter areas. At the end of the period, Robert of Molesme was setting up a new monastery at Citeaux.

There were other factors at work. Church leaders such as Peter Damian, Lanfranc and Anselm were also distinguished monks and their learning contributed to reform. The intellectual revival led to scholars studying a wider variety of texts which led to challenges to accepted notions. There were some individuals who were attracted to the life of a hermit and influenced developments. Patrons who founded monasteries wanted them to be as fervent as possible, in order to gain most merit from their act of endowment. Initiatives came from a number of popes but especially Gregory VII.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 25	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

24 How far was poor leadership responsible for the outcome of the Fourth Crusade?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to the leadership of the crusade, the role of Venice and the divisions in the Eastern Empire.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that the leadership was to blame. Pope Innocent III lost control of the enterprise. The French nobles had different aims. The Venetian Doge followed his ambitions to weaken and then control the Eastern Empire.

Alternatively, the sight of the wealth of Constantinople proved too tempting for the Crusaders and they were deflected from the Holy Land. Alexius III was unable to resist them. Doge Dandolo sowed dissension once Alexius IV was established as emperor. The sack of Constantinople and the establishment of the Latin Empire weakened defences against the Turks and proved disastrous in the long run, even if the Empire, but certainly not the sack, were applauded by Innocent

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 26	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

25 Was the twelfth century more notable for artistic or for intellectual achievement?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates could refer to the development of Gothic architecture, notably the ribbed vault, the pointed arch and the flying buttress and also to civil law, the growth of the universities and some individual scholars such as Peter Abelard and Peter the Lombard.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that artistic achievements are particularly demonstrated in the churches of northern France, with massiveness and gloom giving way to delicacy and light. Ornamental carving and sculpture reflected these trends and the stiff foliage patterns were widely used. In some parts of Europe Romanesque remained dominant.

There was also considerable development intellectually. The church was defining canon law, while Roman law was reviving with studies at Bologna aimed at glossing its meaning to make it clearer. Later scholars aimed at considering how to apply the law in practice. There was also some revival of study of classical texts like Pliny and much work done by translators. Universities developed, beginning with the medical school at Salerno, followed by Bologna, Padua and Naples. In the north, Paris predominated but Orleans and Angers grew from cathedral schools.

In the early part of the century, the disputes between Nominalists and Realists dominated universities and the Schoolmen. Peter Abelard's dialectical methods outlined in *Sic et Non* were very influential despite his personal disasters and Peter the Lombard's textbook on the topic became a standard work.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 27	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

26 Why did the Church rely so heavily on repression in dealing with heretics in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates might refer to heretic groups such as the Humiliati, the Waldensians and the Cathars.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that the Church saw itself as seriously threatened by the heretics and so felt that eradication was the best response. If the assertions of heretical groups were given any credence then the whole authority of the Church was under a challenge.

The Humiliati in Lombardy wanted the clergy to live as ascetics and were ready to set them an example. The Waldenses in Lyon denounced the clergy and believed that the individual Christian could interpret the Bible for himself. The Cathars were linked to the Bogomils in Eastern Europe. In Languedoc, they were protected by local nobles and even Raymond of Toulouse. These factors convinced the Church that they must act. The Church began with condemnation at Councils and sending preachers to convince heretics they were wrong, but if these methods did not work, then repression followed. The Church could rely on some assistance from French kings who had their own interests in defeating the Cathars.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 28	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

Section 6: 1250–c. 1378

27 How valid is the view that the Papacy was more adversely affected by the War of the Sicilian Vespers than any other power?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates might refer to the events which began the war, the main participants and the outcome of twenty years of fighting.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that the Papacy was severely affected. The Popes pursued their aims in Sicily which meant they needed support from the great Roman families such as the Orsini and the Colonna. This was noticeable in the events after the death of Nicholas IV when the factions became deadlocked and eventually led to the election of Celestine V, who then resigned and was replaced by Boniface VIII. Boniface quarrelled with the Colonna. The Papal alliance with the House of Anjou lasted the course of the war. Corruption within the papal administration increased. The Popes were discredited by their obviously secular ambitions and their calling of a crusade to make Charles of Anjou king of Aragon.

Alternatively, other powers suffered to an extent. The French were involved at times along with the Angevins. Charles of Anjou lost Sicily and the French merely retained a claim to parts of southern Italy. Sicily itself remained hostile to the rule of the French, which had been fully demonstrated in the occurrence which began the war in 1282. Charles of Anjou was also resented for his heavy taxation. The outcome perpetuated the rule of Aragon so could be seen to be least adverse for Frederick, son of Peter, whose naval forces had proved crucial in his capture of the Sicilian ports.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 29	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

28 'Religious conviction guided all of Louis IX's actions.' Did it?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates might refer to the role of Louis as an arbitrator, his protection of royal interests, his reduction of revolt in Languedoc and his contribution as a Crusader.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that religious conviction was the guiding light for Louis. In France, he was especially harsh towards blasphemers and was the main force behind the establishment of the Inquisition in France, which led to scores of heretics being burned at the stake. He encouraged preachers, he built abbeys and churches, he banned trial by battle and he sent friars round the country to enquire into abuses. His desire to recapture the Holy Land led him to embark on two crusades, one of which ended with his captivity and payment of a vast ransom and on the other he died, with little having been achieved. He made peace with Henry III of France,.. Louis was in demand as an arbitrator, as a result of his reputation, and his judgements in Flanders and England enhanced French prestige; the growing recognition of French pre-eminence was probably more the reason for the demands made on him for judgements. On his death, miracles attended his relics very rapidly and he was canonised in 1297. Thus his religious convictions were clear.

Alternatively, he had other ambitions. He defeated rebels in Languedoc, where the Lusignans made common cause with Henry III. Henry became his vassal for Aquitaine and Gascony, and abandoned any claim to the other former Angevin lands, He managed, wisely, to stay neutral in the conflict between the Papacy and Frederick II. His government followed the pattern set by his grandfather, but he was equally tenacious of his rights. The Parlement of Paris developed. The royal currency was so respected that he was able to extend it to the whole of France. His reproving of the Pope for the abuses in the church was as much a defence of Gallican rights as a desire for improvement.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 30	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

29 Was his humiliation of the Knights Templar the most important achievement of Philip the Fair?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to Philip's attack on the Templars, his quarrel with Boniface VIII and its outcome, his wars with England and Flanders, his success in raising taxes in France and his centralisation of the administration.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that the humiliation of the Templars was important in that he used shrewd tactics to persuade the Pope to support him, calling a general assembly in France, which urged the Pope to act. The Council of Vienne finally allowed Philip to proceed and the elimination of the Templars enriched the King. The Pope had been forced to accede to Philip's wishes. But the process took longer than Philip had wanted and the main beneficiaries were the Hospitallers, even though they made generous gifts to the monarch.

Alternatively Philip's other achievements mattered more. His foreign policy was successful in that he forced Edward I to seek a truce, but in Flanders he was defeated at Courtrai and the Flemings regained their freedom. Hence Edward I was able to secure a peace treaty and, as he was married to Philip's sister, Gascony remained in his hands. There was some progress in nibbling away at the frontier with the Empire and Franche Comté was acquired through marriage. Domestically, Philip needed to raise taxes to finance his wars and did so by taxing the Church more heavily, expelling the Jews and confiscating their property and treating his Italian bankers in a similar way. He called the three estates to Paris to give his exactions the semblance of consent. He expanded the bureaucracy and governed through his Council and its departments, led by men like Nogaret and Enguerrand de Marigny. Then Philip quarrelled with the Pope over the issue of Church/State supremacy and when Boniface made extreme claims for the Church, he was attacked at Anagni and died soon after. Eventually, Clement V transferred the Papacy to Avignon where Philip's influence proved irresistible.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 31	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

30 How successful were the popes in maintaining their power while resident in Avignon?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates might refer to the pontificates of the various popes who lived at Avignon, their policies towards the Church, towards Italy and their pursuit of a crusade against the Turks.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates argue that the popes were successful in maintaining their control of the Church and brought about its centralisation, making the Papacy more autocratic and increasing Curial dominance in administration and finance. When Councils were held, the popes made it clear that their role was to be co-operative. Appointments to benefices and bishoprics were largely in papal hands, although some lay patrons and rulers refused to accept their role, Fees were established and enforced. Some attempts were made to reform abuses. Heretics were persecuted and efforts made to send missionaries to the East.

Alternatively, the vicissitudes of events in Italy reduced papal power there. Central Italy was in a state of lawlessness and the popes tended to appoint their relatives or Italian supporters to positions of government. The Avignon Papacy was viewed in Italy as being subservient to France, which was an exaggeration, but this meant places like Florence remained hostile. The popes may have hoped to negotiate an end to the Hundred Years War and to set a new crusade in motion but they were not able, under the circumstances, to succeed. Their increased revenues were spent in pursuing their Italian ambitions.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 32	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

Section 7: c. 1378–c. 1461

31 What best explains the fluctuating fortunes of the Italian city states in the fourteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates may refer to various of the city states but Venice, Genoa and Florence are likely to predominate.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that war was often present and its impact can explain changing fortunes even if merchants and bankers nevertheless flourished. Both Venice and Genoa faced problems. Venice was involved in war on the mainland to ensure her grain supplies and in 1358 lost Dalmatia. Genoa suffered from internal disputes and more so from the war with Venice over the Levant, which merged into the war of the Byzantine Emperor against his son, in which they took opposite sides. In 1379–80, Venice came under siege but then strong leadership from the Doge allowed them to turn the tables and besiege the besiegers and emerge the winner. Both were adversely affected by the long wars. Genoa never really recovered and became a French protectorate. Venice, however, with a sound government was able to regain her power. Florence was engaged in war to get control of Lucca, which failed, and some of the bankers like the Bardi faced bankruptcy. War with Pisa followed. Guelf and Ghibelline rivalries rendered Florence disorderly and chaotic, while the Free Companies, under leaders like John Hawkwood, ravaged the countryside, leading to a war with the Papacy, which was blamed. The insurrection of the Ciompi brought further havoc in 1378–82, after which the oligarchs regained power and Florence gradually recovered. Smaller cities like Siena and Pisa suffered far more.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 33	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

32 What best explains the intense rivalries between the Italian city states in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

There is a wide range of factors which could be considered, such as: the very different culture and traditions of each city state; the rise of a strong and often very intense civic patriotism, just as strong as the aggressive nationalism of Europe in the 19th century; there was a long tradition of warfare and competition between them; there was a strong cultural rivalry, as well the usual territorial and wealth acquisition ones; the simple desire to acquire more wealth and territory at the expense of others; the decline/loss of status of some could be prevented by acquiring the wealth/terror of others; with the growing rule by autocrats, their ability as rulers was judged by their ability to acquire; there was considerable wealth there, so mercenaries could be easily hired from Switzerland to do the fighting on their behalf; the considerable strategic significance of some states, such as Bologna, naturally whetted the acquisitive and aggressive appetites of others.

AO2- is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

A range of factors need to be considered. The best will identify the key factor/s and argue a case for them, ideally prioritising, but also indicate why others were of lesser importance. Those who stress that factors changed over time should be rewarded.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 34	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

33 'Valois Burgundy played only a limited role in the Hundred Years War.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. A variety of factors could be mentioned, covering a wide period, such as: courted by both Henry IV and Henry V of England; standing aloof at such critical times as Agincourt; the degree to which Burgundy benefited from the disaster at Agincourt; the acceptance of Henry V's claim to the French throne; the Montereau assassination; Philip the Good's many dealings with the English; 'the hole through which England made its way into France'; Burgundy's vital role at Troyes; the limited assistance in the 'middle' period, bar of course its role with Joan of Arc; in the end it was always a factor/player.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

There is a good case to be made each way. Whether non-intervention could be as significant as actual intervention needs to be considered and often a diplomatic role needs to be reflected on, in contrast to the actual use of soldiers. 'Limited' needs to be reflected on and also whether their role is looked at from a French rather than an English perspective.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 35	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

34 'Over-extended and under-resourced.' Discuss this view of the Byzantine Empire in the years c. 1378 to 1453.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors could be considered, such as: the continuous civil wars – with the monarch (John) V being evicted from the throne by his own son; the Ottoman advance, into Greece and Slav areas; the lack of support from Rome; the Bulgar humiliation; the collapse of the Balkan Entente; the endless dependency for survival on others; the disaster at Kosovo; the nature and extent of the empire itself; the way in which the Turks were supported by Venice and Genoa; however, the success of Tamerlane was a great support; the failure of Manul to consolidate in the early fifteenth century – with again the lack of any Western help; the poor quality of the state infrastructure; the sheer diversity of the Empire; the role of John VIII and his brothers; the failure of the Union of Florence, the ballet of Varna in 1448.

AO2- is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

Both terms need to be considered and both were major issues when it came to the final collapse. Given the extent and structure of the Empire and the very weak centre, the over extension could be agreed with. However, with satisfactory support, there is a case against. Given the threats to the Empire it was under resourced to deal with them, but there is a clear case for arguing that very poor use was made of the resources available. Sensible diplomacy and good administration were never the hallmarks of the later Byzantine Empire.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 36	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

35 Was the reign of Charles VII a period of ‘real recovery’ for France?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors could be considered when arguing each way: the dreadful low point of Troyes; the increasing success in the Hundred Years War; the morale boost provided by Joan of Arc; the crowning at Rheims; Arras in 1435 and the support from Burgundy; the cost to France of Arras; the flight of Louis to Burgundy; the regaining of Paris; the military reforms; the recovery of Normandy and Guyenne; the gradual erosion of the powers of the greater nobility; the importance of growing support from the lesser nobility; the rise of an ‘official’ class; the increasing scope of royal jurisdiction.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

The issue of ‘extent’ needs to be dealt with firmly and here should be a concise and clear answer to that part of the question. Reflection on the ‘real’ aspect should also be there, with comment on whether it was more superficial than lasting. It could well be argued that he made a start on an upward curve and France in 1461 was a very different place from the dire situation after Troyes and Agincourt.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 37	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

36 What best explains the rise of Poland in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors could be considered, such as: the geographical advantages with flexible borders; it became the largest European kingdom west of Muscovy; its decentralisation could be a real asset; unusual dynastic continuity, in both fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; the excellent basis laid in fourteenth century by Casimir III; the marriage of Jadwiga to the Lithuanian Jagellion and the resulting unity; the development of the powerful and able Jagellion dynasty; the highly competent early Jagellion rule from 1386 to 1434 providing a firm basis; useful and highly co-operative relations with both Hungary and Bohemia; greater Europeanisation; religious unity; the good working relationship between landowning class and the monarch; sensible foreign policy.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

There is no one single reason, expect perhaps the continuity and ability of the Jagellion kings building on the work of the Piast dynasty. The extent to which it was good judgement, rather than good fortune, could be debated. What is looked for is a range of factors, carefully prioritised and a well evidenced judgement.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 38	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

Section 8: c. 1461–c. 1561

37 To what extent does Louis XI deserve his title of ‘Louis the Prudent’?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A lot is known here and there is a lot that could be covered: Louis XI was a hard worker, but a hard man; committed to his role; highly authoritarian, but that was perhaps what was needed and expected; a great information gatherer and keen on diplomacy, often with very mixed results; a phrase he used ‘never so great as when up to his neck in water’ could equally well be used for him; he was very good at getting out of very difficult situations, but there were cases where his failings had got him into them in the first case, e.g. Arras; certainly successful in his aims in Burgundy; the reduction of French baronial power; the exclusion of the English; Crown income increased; trade and the ‘fairs’ started to expand; there was a real sense of monarchical recovery. Most of these points could be used to support the case for ‘prudent’, but the methodology used in many cases might form the basis of a case ‘against’.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

Reflection on the term ‘prudent’ in the context of France in the fifteenth century is looked for. Obviously, in consideration of what he attained for France in terms of Burgundy, there is a valid case for dealing with the English and ‘centralisation’. But, there are ample examples, with his ‘diplomacy’ in particular where he could not be seen to be prudent at all. Much depends on the definition utilised and the quality of reflection on it.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 39	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

38 To what extent were the Italian Wars caused by a failure of diplomacy?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A very wide range of causative factors could be considered, such as: the way in which the great powers found it a convenient theatre of operations to conduct their rivalries; Italy's inability to resist invaders; simple geographical factors; the depth of internal rivalries; the importance of control of the Papacy; the elitism of Italian culture being a contributory factor – they were too involved in patronage and court life to 'mind the shop' both economically and political; neglect of the usual pattern of alliances between powers (the diplomacy factor); a reluctance to invest in the productive sectors of the economy; lack of political stability in Italy and the traditional rivalries; a lack of any 'national' feeling; simple greed on the part of other powers; internal chaos made it a tempting target; the ambitions of Charles VIII, Louis XII and Francis I; the Spanish/Imperial involvement of Charles V.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focussed and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

Certainly, there is a case to develop on the 'diplomatic' front and there are many possible culprits who could be seen to have failed, such as the Papacy and the Medici clan. However, French ambitions and the desire of the Habsburgs to prevent the growth of French power in Italy and the Mediterranean generally, were also key factors.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 40	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

39 'Dominated by Italians who had only Italian interests at heart.' Discuss this view of the Papacy between 1458 and 1513.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

There are many examples which could be used to back up the statement, such as: Pius II – a Piccolomini from Siena: well-meaning but lacking in any reforming zeal; Calixtus III, the Borgia who made his nephew a cardinal who later became Alexander VII; Paul II, a Venetian, and nephew of Eugenius IV who was remarkable for his inactivity; the totally secular Sixtus IV (Liguria) who promoted his criminal nephews and was involved in the Medici murders; the ineffective and beleaguered Innocent VIII from Genoa; the Borgia Alexander VI, who took worldliness to new heights with his promotion of his nephews and the public acknowledgement of his mistress; Julian II (nephew of Sixtus IV) always totally involved in the complexities of Italian politics; and finally Leo X, the son of Lorenzo who had been bought his cardinalship at the age of 13.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

The Italian domination would be hard to argue against but the 'Italian interests' aspect is easier to challenge. The secular roles adopted by many could be seen as damaging to Italy and given that the Papacy could be seen as a potential unifying force against foreign intervention, it could well be seen as an 'un-Italian' feature. Interests could be very personal and the degree of nepotism, (perhaps the least of their crimes?) might suggest other factors were closer to their hearts.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 41	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

40 'More successful as Holy Roman Emperor than in any other role.' Discuss this view of Maximilian of Habsburg.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

There is a very wide range of factors which can be considered, for example: his defeat by the Swiss in 1499 and being compelled to recognise the Confederation as virtually independent; Maximilian's attempts to revive chivalry; his gains in 1493 of Artois and Franche-Comté; his marriage to Mary of Burgundy, the daughter of Charles the Rash; the many ideas for constitutional reform which came to nothing; his regular inability to raise troops and/or money; the Reichstag of 1495; the 'Common Penny' failure; the *Reichsregiment*; alienation of the Electors; the degree of success in unifying the Austrian lands; the Bavarian succession; his role with the Turks; the degree of anarchy in Germany; his impotence in the Italian Wars.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

There is a strong case to support the view in the quote, as Austria was to remain the basis of Habsburg power for a long time afterwards. His successful dynastic role could be largely down to his father's choice of bride for him. He certainly tried to achieve elsewhere – both in territorial acquisition and in developing the role of the Emperor, and creating a support system for the role he had assumed – but there is little in the way of success there.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 42	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

41 How convincing is the view that Ferdinand and Isabella achieved more in their foreign than in their domestic policies?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

There is an enormous range of factors which could be considered and expect probably more on domestic than foreign policy (allow Granada, Navarre, Perpignan etc. to count as ‘foreign’). Candidates might discuss: the degree of fusion and unity attained in Spain; the weakness of the crown largely ended; the scene set for the growth of a great Spanish empire; dealing with Portugal; feudal barons; money shortages; fragmented jurisdictions; the termination of Castilian anarchy; the conciliar work; currency reform; the Mesta; the development of the army; the Moors; the conquest of Granada; the move into Italy; the work with the Church and the New World exploration.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

There is a very strong argument either way. If ‘foreign’ is interpreted quite broadly, then there is real achievement there both in terms of events within the Iberian Peninsula, as well as in the Pyrenees and the wider Mediterranean, and in the New World. However, there is an equally powerful case to be made for the ‘domestic’, as what they achieved when starting from such a low base it quite remarkable. Allow comment on what happened to their legacy as well. There might be a ‘short term versus long term’ contrast, but, equally well, there could be good answers which simply argue that both were exceptional and explain why.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 43	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

Section 9: Themes c. 1200–c. 1516

42 Did the code of chivalry serve any useful purpose?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates could refer to the ideals of chivalry, the development of knightly orders and the role of heraldry.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that chivalry was embodied in the order of knighthood, whose members were expected to be models of courage and courtesy, generosity and faithfulness and to protect the weak, especially ladies, and defend the church. The training of an esquire and then a knight did reflect the skills they would need in battle. The foundation of the chivalric orders such as the Bath and the Garter in England, the Golden Fleece in Burgundy and St Michael in France were useful in allowing monarchs to reward some of their chief supporters very cheaply. The heralds, in authorising the coats of arms to be worn by knights, performed a useful role in assisting identification in battle. Some famous knights, like William the Marshal, deserved their fine reputations. The sense of honour linked to knighthood is illustrated by Froissart's Chronicle.

Alternatively, chivalry was of little use. Courage and skill in arms were insufficient to win in many battles. At Agincourt, the knights were mown down by archers. The heavy armour made it difficult for unhorsed knights to get up again. Professional captains were more intent on providing for their troops than on protecting damsels in distress. The Hundred Years War particularly illustrated this.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 44	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

43 Was Gothic art more decorative than it was realistic?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates could refer to architecture, sculpture and painting, notably of illuminated manuscripts.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates could argue that the art was largely paid for by the rich and so reflected their tastes and interests, which lay particularly in the decorative achievements of the artists. In architecture, this was especially the case with the soaring arches and rich embellishments being the focus of the art. The increasing skill of the masons and the sophistication of the designs reflect this. They began to use colour and stained glass to add further dimensions to the beauty of their buildings. Alternatively, design moved towards naturalism, the builders and sculptors were reflecting the world around them from putting their enemies on gargoyles to recording farmyard scenes on misericords. As the period wore on, statuary representations of figures became more realistic and, even on tombs, began to show traces of character. Illuminated manuscripts often featured detailed observation of nature and of daily life. Masterpieces like the *Très Riches Heures* of the Duke of Berry reflected this interest. The painting of portraits in realistic settings further illustrates this move. But it could be argued that the two definitions are not mutually exclusive.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 45	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

44 What best explains the development of conciliarism?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required.

Candidates might refer to the Councils which met at Pisa in 1409, Constance in 1414, Pavia in 1423 and Basle in 1431.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that conciliarism came about because of the abuses and corruption within the Church, which was seen to be weakening its position. The Great Schism was one clear example. The need to end the Schism led the University of Paris to urge that a General Council was the best way forward. Hence, the idea evolved that the Pope was subject to a General Council and could be judged and even deposed by such a council representing the universal Church. The autocracy practised by some popes had the effect of making such ideas attractive. There was also the issue of heresy in the shape of Jan Hus. As time went on, the Councils attempted reform but in the teeth of papal opposition, and there was some diminution of papal taxation.

But equally, the popes succeeded in preventing any real reform which would dilute their powers. The rivalries of the groups at the Councils were such that little could be achieved. The Council at Pavia only met because of the agreement to hold Councils regularly and its only real decision was that the next should be at Basle. The Council there was divided again and a splinter group met at Ferrara. Eugenius IV failed in his scheme to reunite the Western and Eastern Churches and the Council, now moved to Lausanne, dissolved itself in 1449 when Nicholas V became Pope. National interests triumphed over the need for church reform, which explains the later developments and the side-lining of conciliarism.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 46	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

45 'Without patronage there would have been no Italian Renaissance.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors could be considered, such as: the strong links with classical civilisation already there, both visual and written; the usual fall of Constantinople-Greek revival argument; the strong universities and educational traditions already there; the strong local cultural traditions such as painting in Florence; the degree of local autonomy; the fact that there was nothing to discourage non-conformity and innovation; civic pride encouraged artistic and cultural endeavour; the existing libertarian tradition; Pius II referred to a 'change loving Italy'; the great wealth of the papacy, cities and individuals; yet the papacy, the great families, the guilds and the cities all supported it; artistic patronage strengthened political authority; the decline linked to Spanish, Catholic, foreign autocratic domination in the later sixteenth century.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

A debate is expected on the role of patronage when compared with many other factors in the whole development of the Renaissance in Italy. Certainly patronage was vital in its own way, but so was the absence of constraint, a fine and longstanding liberal/humanist tradition, and communities where the artist was given great respect.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 47	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

46 To what extent were the later Middle Ages a period of social change?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

With this type of question, a very broad range of factors can be considered and there should not be too close a line drawn between what might be seen as ‘economic’ and ‘social’. Issues which might be covered are: family; marriage; the status of women; the role of religion and the Church; landownership; the status of the peasant, the serf and the artisan; the decline of serfdom and the rise of social mobility; rebellion and unrest; feudalism and seigneurial rights; noble status; population; urbanisation; kinship and neighbourhood solidarities; price rise implications; credit availability and the rise of a bourgeoisie; education.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

There is scope for a very ‘broad brush’ answer which looks at the whole period, as well as a more detailed look at specific issues or regions. Flexibility should be allowed in terms of the period covered. The best responses will give a firm answer to the ‘extent’ part of the question.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 48	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	21

47 What best explains the dominance of Spain and Portugal in European expansion overseas in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly.

A wide range of factors could be considered, such as: Portugal – simple geography; the tradition going back to Ceuta in 1415; major developments there in nautical science, shipbuilding, and methods of exploration and colonisation; the link between the Reconquest and expansion; the royal encouragement of Henry the Navigator and John II; the success of da Gama and Diaz, especially the former with the spice trade; the work of Cabral. For Spain, candidates could consider: the support of Ferdinand and Isabella given to Columbus; the lack of any opposition – the Dutch involved elsewhere; the involvement of the French and the English in their own internal affairs; and, the sheer ability of the Conquistadores.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

There should be an argument that they just got lucky as there was no serious opposition, either in the new territories, or from other countries such as Holland, but that is too simplistic a view. There was a real drive from the top and, certainly, in the case of Portugal, a desire to expand and innovate and explore. There was a lot of talent there and it was well used.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.