
A-level History

7042/2F-Component 2F The Sun King: Louis XIV, France and Europe,
1643–1715
Mark scheme

June 2018

Version/Stage: 1.0 Final

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

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

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

Level of response marking instructions

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

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

Step 1 Determine a level

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

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

Step 2 Determine a mark

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

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

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

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

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 economic and financial problems of the French monarchy between 1661 and 1666. **[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

- while the document is a royal edict, drawn up by secretaries and advisers, it is the will of Louis XIV who would need to agree to its contents in detail
- the occasion is 7 months after Louis XIV's assumption of personal government and soon after the arrest of Fouquet
- although a legal document, it does not have a formal legal tone but largely seeks to explain the grounds for the action in a paternalistic and authoritative tone
- it is written to be read by lawyers and the leading people in France.

Content and argument

- the source blames economic problems on the mismanagement of the royal finances and the economy
- this is used to justify the adoption of personal government and a vigorous review of expenditure by the newly appointed Colbert to reduce waste
- to complete this task, heavy punishments would be inflicted on embezzlers – in actual fact, the only person to be severely punished was Foucault; the rest simply had to pay a years' income to the state's coffers
- the source unwittingly hints at a more major cause of the financial problems – the war – 'feel once again the effects of peace' and 'the pressing needs of the state'. This was the major cause of France's 451 million livres of debt
- the income from the fines of this court did assist Colbert to buy back offices and to reduce the interest rates on future loans and waste.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- while the source is anonymous, it is clearly written by someone at court with a good knowledge of events in political circles around Louis XIV
- the occasion is soon after Colbert has started his mercantilist policies in 1664
- the audience is clearly the political elite in France including Colbert and Louis XIV himself
- the tone is clearly hostile to Colbert with the sarcasm about 'if we are so unfortunate to enjoy peace' with Colbert's policies.

Content and argument

- the blame for France's short-term problems is Colbert's mercantilist policies and reforms based on the raising of tariffs on imported goods, especially from the Dutch
- the reaction to these mercantilist policies by foreign countries is to purchase elsewhere. The author has overlooked the tariff wars which would build up as a consequence but not that wars would result
- mercantilism is actually leading to harm by other countries not purchasing French surpluses in wine and grain and leading to a shortage of cash
- the argument is prejudiced as there were arguably benefits from Colbert's mercantilist policies such as encouraging the development of manufactures royales, for example the Gobelins factory in 1663
- while the policies of reducing office holders was harmful to the nobility, Colbert's purchase of offices in the short-term reduced Louis' outgoings which was beneficial to the state's finances.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Colbert was Louis XIV's finance minister from 1661 and was Louis XIV's man of business although not his chief minister
- in 1666, this is just before the outbreak of the War of Devolution and Louis had already laid a claim on behalf of his wife to territories in the Spanish Netherlands
- this was a private memorandum intended for Louis XIV and perhaps his close advisers
- the tone and emphasis is deferential and precise but is challenging Louis' own views.

Content and argument

- Colbert is clearly trying to get Louis to reduce his spending already on his pleasures which were expensive. Many examples of this expenditure could be made – for example the palace at Versailles had already started to be developed with the forecourt in 1662. This usefully reflects a major tension between minister and master
- his main emphasis on spending was on sea warfare. This again is Colbert's agenda rather than Louis', as Colbert wishes to build up the navy to protect trade and so increase revenue
- the idea that money on land war could be saved until necessary appears surprising in the context of the claim Louis has already made on territory in the Spanish Netherlands after the death of Philip IV in 1665
- however, Colbert does concede that there should be money spent on foreign policy and large sums and pensions were paid by Louis. For example, he bought Dunkirk from Charles II in 1662 for 5 million livres
- the attack on the King's personal spending could be criticised as there were some small financial advantages of the King's spending on warfare and Versailles. The War of Devolution of 1667–8

cost 18 million livres but brought about substantial gains in territory and presumably people and trade to tax. Equally, Versailles was used as a showcase for the manufactures royales.

Section B

- 02** 'Louis XIV's decision to revoke the Edict of Nantes in 1685 was taken primarily on religious grounds.'

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 candidates 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 decision to revoke the Edict of Nantes in 1685 was taken primarily on religious grounds might include:

- Louis XIV was a firm Catholic and saw Huguenots as heretics
- Louis XIV had not helped the Holy Roman Emperor, Leopold, during the Siege of Vienna in 1683; he wanted to regain his title as 'Most Christian Majesty'
- Louis XIV's Coronation Oath in 1653 where he had committed himself to eradicate heresy. He took this oath very seriously
- Louis XIV was encouraged by his Jesuit confessors to do this
- Louis XIV would gain popularity with the Catholic majority of the population.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that Louis XIV's decision to revoke the Edict of Nantes in 1685 was taken primarily on religious grounds might include:

- Louis XIV wanted to be an absolutist monarch; he could not allow the continuation of heresy to challenge his political authority – following the concept of 'cuius regio eius religio'
- Louis XIV no longer had the restraining influence of Colbert who saw the economic benefits brought about by Huguenots
- the exaggerated reports of mass conversions had led Louis XIV to believe that it was now feasible to end the problem of Huguenots
- Louis XIV was influenced by his political advisers, like Louvois, who wanted to gain more influence over the King by a successful solution to the issue of the Huguenots
- Louis XIV took the decision in 1685 because France was at peace which gave him the opportunity to bring substantial resources to bear to carry out the decision.

Good answers will probably recognise that the theory of 'cuius regio eius religio' means that politics and religion overlap in Louis XIV's France and so there is a mixture of motives. For example, heretics were a threat politically as well as religiously. However, good answers should come to a clear judgement on the issue and much depends on how you view Louis in 1685. He can be seen as someone who has discovered personal morality and so was motivated for the sake of his eternal soul to deal with heresy. Alternatively, he can be seen as someone who was strongly influenced by those around him and thus the death of Colbert and the ambitions of Louvois may have led to the decisive action.

03 To what extent did Louis XIV's authority weaken in the years 1685 to 1697? **[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 authority weakened in the years 1685 to 1697 might include:

- Louvois took decisions himself and disobeyed Louis XIV who suffered for a time from the impact of an anal fistula – for example he ordered the burning of the town of Trèves in 1690 although Louis refused to endorse this
- Louis was increasingly influenced by Mme de Maintenon and the Jesuit priests – for example in spending 1.4 million livres in building and supporting the Saint Cyr school
- due to this influence, Versailles exercised less influence over the nobility as their desire to be there decreased
- the long-term impact of Colbert's death meant that there was no longer a 'North wind' to energise the administration – costs of tax collection more than tripled between 1685 and 1695 and intendants often served more than three years in their 'pays'
- Louis' image upon which he relied for his authority was tarnished by setbacks in the Nine Years War, like the loss of Namur in 1695. Internal critics, like Fénelon and the Burgundian Circle, satirised Louis directly in *The Adventures of Telemachus* of 1693–4 rather than his ministers, like Mazarin and Colbert in former times.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that Louis XIV's authority weakened in the years 1685 to 1697 might include:

- Louis restored his authority over Louvois in 1691 which may have led to his death and thereafter took personal control of the army
- the influence of Mme de Maintenon and the Jesuits have been exaggerated for example over Quietism. These influences predate 1685 and in key areas of policy, Louis made the decisions himself and in fact took a greater direct interest in government
- Louis managed the political dynasties of the Colberts, Le Telliers and Phélypeaux effectively. He retained the Colberts and Le Telliers but promoted the more able Phélypeaux
- despite Colbert's death, his successors were able to raise more money in taxation than ever before by extending the range of consumer goods taxed and introducing the capitation in 1695; this suggests that Louis XIV's authority over the people was stronger than ever
- by the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, Louis' image was enhanced in the eyes of many Catholics. His 'propaganda machine' did not break down.

Good answers will recognise that there are a variety of measures to assess whether Louis' authority grew weaker, or not, after 1685 and will explore some of them. These can include assessments of both Louis's domestic and international authority. They will also probably recognise that they need to compare the arguments for and against the proposition in this question – for example Louvois did begin to dominate Louis but Louis restored his control. Mme de Maintenon did influence some of his decisions but in other policy areas her role was less important. Students may also argue that Louis' authority was not that strong before 1685 – for example did Versailles ever exercise much influence over the nobility? They may also debate the nature of the relationship between advisers and the monarch in any monarchy and may decide that ultimately the monarch makes the decisions and chooses his advisers.

- 04** To what extent did the Peace of Ryswick of 1697 damage France's international position? **[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 the Peace of Ryswick of 1697 damaged France's international position might include:

- the Peace failed to achieve Louis' plans for expansion; in fact it led to a loss of territory for France, including all lands beyond the Rhine and the Pyrenees
- the Peace made France less defensible as the idea of a *pré carré* was damaged by the right gained by the Dutch to garrison towns on the French border with the Spanish Netherlands
- the Peace meant that Louis had to recognize England and Scotland as Protestant states under William of Orange rather than kingdoms ruled by a Catholic, James II. This meant the loss of a powerful potential ally into a clear enemy and long-term rival
- the Peace served to undermine Louis XIV's image upon which so much of France's international position rested. It was seen by many as a humiliation for Louis and encouraged internal criticism, following the example of Fénelon
- the Peace of Ryswick forced the French to return to the much lower tariffs on Dutch goods they levied in 1664. This reduced the protection for French manufacturing industries and weakened France's economic strength upon which its international position depended.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that the Peace of Ryswick of 1697 damaged France's international position might include:

- despite Louis' failure to win the war, the Peace had not been as damaging as it could have been – for example France did not lose any colonies. The peace recognised the loss of France's international position which had already happened in the war. This showed that France retained a strong international status
- Louis did not lose all of his chain of fortresses on the border with the Spanish Netherlands in the Peace. This allowed France to still be defensible as shown in the War of Spanish Succession
- the Peace allowed Louis to retain Strasbourg – a key prize needed to defend France's northern border from the Dutch and of immense symbolic value to Louis' prestige – and 82 towns in lower Alsace
- the peace allowed negotiations to take place over the future of Spain after the death of Carlos II and led to a partition Peace in 1698 which strengthened France's international position
- the generous peace terms to the Spanish, despite their defeat, may have enhanced France's international position by leading Carlos II to consider leaving his territories to France in their entirety.

Answers will need to look at how France's international position was affected, both positively and negatively, by the Peace. One way of doing so would be to compare points such as how defensible it was after the Peace. On the whole, answers will probably argue that the Peace did damage France's international position but that the extent was limited; Louis held parity with the alliance marshalled against him and France's negotiations over the Peace allowed the possibility of renewing French strength by gains from Spain in the near future.