



A-level HISTORY 7042/2F

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

Mark scheme

June 2019

Version: 1.0 Final

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

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

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

System Name	Description
?	Questionable or unclear comment or fact
^	Omission – of evidence or comment
Cross	Inaccurate fact
H Line	Incorrect or dubious comment or information
IR	Irrelevant material
SEEN_BIG	Use to mark blank pages or plans
Tick	Creditworthy comment or fact
On page comment	Use text box if necessary to exemplify other annotations and add further comment. Always provide a text box comment at the end of each answer.

Level of response marking instructions

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

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

Step 1 Determine a level

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

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

Step 2 Determine a mark

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

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

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

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

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

Section A

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the problems surrounding the issue of the Spanish Succession. **[30 marks]**

Target: AO2

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25-30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19-24**
- L3:** Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13-18**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7-12**
- L1:** The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-6**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

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

Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Louis, as leader of France, is setting out his negotiating position to his ambassador so that he can manage Louis' interests appropriately. This means that the source will represent Louis' views at this point very clearly
- the comte de Tallard was Louis' representative in London and thus can be rightly assumed to be trusted by Louis and so again the letter will very probably reflect Louis' true views
- the timing of the letter was after the Treaty of Ryswick and during the negotiations for a partition treaty to resolve the issue of the Spanish Succession
- the tone of the letter is businesslike; it is written clearly as it is intended to make it clear to Tallard what Louis' thinking was and what he was prepared to accept.

Content and argument

- Louis shows that he considers his son is the legitimate heir – this is because his son was the grandchild via his mother, Maria Theresa, of Phillip IV of France. Thus, he was the closest relative of the current Spanish King, Carlos II
- the other claimants, the Elector of Bavaria and the Archduke, were more distant relatives but belonged to Carlos' paternal family, the Habsburgs. Thus, the decision was swept up with the dynastic struggle between the Habsburgs and the Bourbons
- however, Louis realised that his son would not be allowed to take the throne of Spain by other European states because it would make France too powerful
- this was an especial concern in 1698 because the 9 Years War had just ended; Louis' willingness to compromise was through his fear of 'a new war in Europe as great as the last one'
- William III, as King of England and ruler of the Netherlands, was the most powerful man in Europe and so to avoid a confrontation he was prepared to accept William's proposals.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- this is a formal treaty, written by lawyers with the consent of the leaders of three of the countries involved in the issue of the Spanish Succession
- the timing of the treaty, dated three months after Louis showed his agreement to the compromise proposed by William III, shows that the English and Dutch were happy with the arrangement. The absence of the Habsburgs of Spain and the Empire shows their weakness at this point
- the emphasis is on the necessity of action due to Carlos' health and to establish a binding and lasting resolution to avoid conflict. This is intended to be a statement to the audience for the treaty – the leading political figure of Europe including Carlos and the Spanish court
- its tone is legal and clear so that there can be no doubt about what the treaty was establishing as a rule.

Content and argument

- the Dauphin was only granted territory in Italy, separate from France. The rest of Europe were not willing to concede territory adjoining France, especially from the Spanish Netherlands which could challenge the rest of Europe
- however, the Habsburg gains were divided between the Archduke and the eldest son of the Elector of Bavaria (who although a Wittelsbach was very closely related to the Habsburgs) so that there would be a greater equivalence between the two sides
- the countries not directly involved in the dispute wanted to maintain the balance of power in Europe to discourage countries from going to war
- all of these arrangements would only occur if the King of Spain died without issue. This was unlikely as Carlos II was physically and mentally disabled and although married, he was probably impotent and was very sickly
- in particular, the King of Spain was not party to the agreement. Carlos had his own ideas about the succession; he wanted the whole of the Spanish territories to pass to one heir. The Austrians were not signatories but were largely securing the bulk of the prize.

Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the author was a royal favourite and so would be expected to give a positive view of events from the King's point of view
- the occasion was the King's acceptance of the will of Carlos II which gave all of the Spanish possessions and throne to Louis' younger grandson, Philip d'Anjou, provided he renounced any claim to the French throne
- the marquis was present for at least part of the event – once the doors to the chamber were opened – so he is an eyewitness
- the tone and emphasis of the source is of a factual report although it flatters the King – 'long tribute'. The King is also conscious of the sense of theatre – this is history being made and the achievement of a long-term goal of his reign.

Content and argument

- Louis has decided to accept the will of the King of Spain. Since the first partition treaty, the eldest son of the Elector of Bavaria had died and the new partition treaty was never signed by the Holy Roman Emperor

- Louis believed that he had the legal right to agree to the new will because of his grandson's legitimate claim ('his birth has called him to the Crown') and the lack of ratification of the second treaty meant it was not binding
- he may well have believed that other monarchs, like William III, would accept this not just on the grounds of legality but also because it supported the principle of inheritance upon which the whole institution of monarchy depended
- as ever, Louis claimed the endorsement of God for these events – but the claim that the Spanish, in general, supported this was probably true as this would allow their kingdom to remain united and powerful and certainly most Spaniards fought for their new king
- his advice to his grandson foreshadowed future problems – the union between the nations of Spain was not the way to preserve the peace in Europe and did not really respect Carlos' will; most European countries would eventually challenge Louis' actions and lead to the very damaging War of the Spanish Succession.

Section B

- 02** To what extent were Mazarin's foreign policies more successful than his domestic policies in the years 1653 to 1661? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO1

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

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

Arguments/factors suggesting that Mazarin's foreign policies were more successful than his domestic policies in the years 1653 to 1661 might include:

- Mazarin did not support the claims of Charles, the son of Louis XIV's aunt, to be King of England. This avoided a foreign confrontation when France was fully occupied with the war against Spain and led to the support of England in the war against Spain by the Treaty of Westminster in 1659
- using fears of the ambitious new Holy Roman Emperor, he was able to create the League of German Princes in 1658, which gave France the right to 'protect' the Rhineland
- the Treaty of the Pyrenees, in 1659, has been seen as masterful in gaining the Pyrenees as a southern boundary and expanding France's northern border and arranging the marriage with Maria Theresa, which would eventually lead to a Bourbon ascending the Spanish throne. Mazarin knew the Spanish would not find the money for the dowry which would invalidate Louis' renunciation of claims by his offspring to the Spanish throne
- domestically, the period is characterised by gross financial mismanagement with borrowing doubling after 1655 and enormous frauds perpetrated both by himself and Fouquet
- there was no real attempt to promote trade and industry; indeed, he entered into a harmful tariff war with England after 1654, by taxing English textile exports which led to reprisals against French wine.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that Mazarin's foreign policies were more successful than his domestic policies in the years 1653 to 1661 might include:

- the costs of the war were crippling to France; the real source of domestic discontent and indebtedness was Mazarin's policy to continue the war against Spain
- Mazarin tried to persuade the German electors to elect Louis as Holy Roman Emperor in 1658. This was an unrealistic aim
- Mazarin was effective in bringing about peace with the former Frondeurs by concessions like accepting parlement's rights and scope for remonstrance, reducing the number of intendants appointed and intervening less in judicial appointments
- Mazarin dealt very effectively with discontent in Marseilles in 1660
- Mazarin's main domestic policy was to train the future king for his personal rule; this he did very effectively, for example by involving Louis in taking control of Marseilles or examining government matters with the young king between 1653 and 1655.

Most students will probably conclude that Mazarin's foreign policies were far more successful than his domestic ones; Mazarin made conspicuous gains for France by his foreign policy but only increased corruption and economic malaise by his domestic policy. However, it is arguable that most of Mazarin's domestic problems, burgeoning debt and the need to placate parlement by reducing royal power and allowing corruption, were a product of his key foreign policy decision to pursue the Spanish war.

- 03** To what extent was the policy of Reunions in the years 1680 to 1684 more defensive than offensive? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO1

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

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

Arguments/factors suggesting the policy of Reunions in the years 1680 to 1684 was more defensive than offensive might include:

- the process was predicated on the alleged defence of Louis' rights pursued by legal means
- many of the gains made by the policy occurred on the North East border which was the most vulnerable to attack
- many of the lands gained in the North East were quickly fortified and so strengthened the précarré being constructed by Vauban
- Louis' ultimate aim was to have the natural barrier of the Rhine as his border as far as possible in the east; the territories gained were moving him closer to this defensive goal
- gains elsewhere also had a defensive purpose; the acquisition of Casale by bribery to control a potential bridgehead across the Alps for Habsburg troops and so protected the south east border.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that the policy of Reunions in the years 1680 to 1684 was more defensive than offensive might include:

- the policy did not just involve peaceful legal methods – many of the lands were seized by military force, such as Luxembourg
- the capture of Strasbourg was predominantly offensive as Louis had no tangible claim
- moreover, the capture of Strasbourg gave Louis control of a bridgehead over the Rhine which would allow moving French troops into Germany; this questions the idea of having the Rhine as a natural frontier
- the policy did involve the expansion of France, which was viewed by France's enemies as offensive and led to the formation of the League of Augsburg in 1686 to challenge Louis' expansionism
- the policy led to a conflict with Spain, provoked by a French blockade of Luxembourg in the winter of 1681–2; this blockade was clearly offensive in nature.

Students will need to show a clear understanding of the policy of Reunions to be able to form a fully balanced judgement about its nature. Good students need to explore the case for both descriptions of the policy and may well conclude that the policy was defensively motivated but aggressively pursued.

04 'Louis XIV's religious policies changed significantly in the 1690s.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

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

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

Arguments/factors suggesting that Louis XIV's religious policies changed significantly in the 1690s might include:

- Innocent XI's death in 1689 led to better relations with the Church in the 1690s which meant he could persuade Popes to issue denunciations of Jansenism in 1690 and 1694
- in 1693, Louis withdrew the Gallican Articles which recognised papal authority over the Church in France and so weakened his support for Gallicanism
- Louis withdrew his claim to extend the right of *régale* over the whole of France in the same year
- Louis took a less aggressive posture towards the Huguenots after the Nine Years War; in 1698 he issued a declaration which ended the enforcement of attendance at masses and ended the exhumation and desecration of corpses buried without Catholic rites.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that that Louis XIV's religious policies changed significantly in the 1690s might include:

- many of Louis' policies were unchanged in the 1690s because he was still a strong Catholic and remained strongly influenced by Madame de Maintenon and the Jesuits; for example, he still claimed to be Europe's most Catholic monarch and supported the restoration of the Catholic James II's in England until 1698
- the Gallican articles were still read and taught and the *régale* money Louis had taken from disputed areas of France was never repaid to the Pope
- Louis still made no attempt to tax the Church, still relying on *dons gratuits*
- Louis remained hostile to heresy. He silenced the Quietists by imprisoning Guyon in 1695, still outlawed the public practice of Huguenotism and was keen to oppress Jansenism.

There were some changes in Louis' religious policies in the 1690s, but students need to debate how significant they were. Clearly, Innocent XI's death in 1689 had some significance for Louis XIV's religious policies because the two had been at odds over issues like the Gallican Articles and *régale*, which were resolved soon after his death. However, this change must be measured against the fact that the core of Louis' religious policies remained largely the same – hostility to heresy and not abandoning the Gallicans completely. Good students will probably conclude that some aspects of Louis XIV's religious policies – especially those towards the Pope – did change but that the fundamentals remained intact.