



A-level HISTORY 7042/2F

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

Mark scheme

June 2023

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 Examiner.

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

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2023 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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, ie 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.

Section A

- 0 1** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the role of Cardinal Mazarin in the Frondes.

[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

- Marshal d'Estrées was a leading French General and Ambassador who worked under both Richelieu and Mazarin. He is well placed to comment on the political situation leading up to the Fronde in 1648, adding value to the source
- the source is taken from Marshal d'Estrées' book which was published during the reign of Louis XIV. Therefore, the nature of the source could add value as he is still critical of Mazarin, suggesting that his aim is not to simply appease the King
- the fact Marshal d'Estrées is in Rome until 1648 may lead some students to question the extent of his insight and could be used to challenge the value of the source as he was not able to witness the deteriorating relationship between the Government, Parlement and the Nobility first hand
- the tone of the source is balanced, which could add value as it suggests the author is suitably distanced from the situation in France and can provide a factual account.

Content and argument

- Marshal d'Estrées directly addresses the outbreak of the Fronde and lays blame on Mazarin for his inability to understand affairs of state, the discontent caused by the continued war with Spain, and because of his lack of French heritage. This is valuable as these reasons were a key source of discontent among both the parlements and the Nobility at the time
- the source also states that Mazarin sought to have authority over other ministers, which is valuable as this was a key source of tension leading up to the Fronde with nobles such as Conde
- the source argues that Mazarin's punishment of the revolutionaries only made things worse, which is valuable as the arrest of individuals, such as Pierre Broussel, ignited furious protest in the city of Paris
- however, the argument that Mazarin, and Richelieu before him, both steered France calmly prior to 1648 could weaken the value of the source as it implies that Mazarin's role in causing tension was merely short term.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the source is a letter from Mazarin, the Chief Minister of France, during Louis XIV's regency period. The source provides an insight into Mazarin's beliefs about the cause of tension in France that culminated in the outbreak of the Frondes in 1648. This is valuable in determining Mazarin's view on his role in the outbreak of the Frondes

- it is a private letter between Mazarin and one of his allies, which implies that he can be truthful which increases the value of the source. However, the fact he is writing to a friend could reduce the value as he is not under any critical scrutiny
- the letter was written days prior to the outbreak of the Fronde, which makes it valuable as it captures Mazarin's thoughts on the cause of tensions precisely before the rebellion started in Paris
- the tone of the source is very defensive, which students may argue limits the value as the purpose of the source is for Mazarin to distance the blame for the Fronde from himself. Equally, students may decide to argue that the desperate tone and need to justify his actions may increase the value of the source as it may suggest there is some truth in the actions Mazarin is claiming are false.

Content and argument

- Mazarin claims that a key source of tension in France is the corruption amongst the parlements and the Nobility, which is valuable as corruption was widespread during the regency of Louis XIV
- the source also implies that the parlements and the Nobles disliked Mazarin because of his Sicilian background, which has value as his power was envied by the Nobles of the Robe
- the source refers to parlements across the whole of France, which strengthens the value of the source as Frondes erupted across the country following the actions of the Parlement of Paris in August 1648
- the source's main argument is that Mazarin is the innocent party and that he is being scapegoated by the parlements and Nobility, which could limit the value of the source as it fails to recognise any weaknesses of Mazarin himself.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the source is a mocking pamphlet written by an anonymous author outlining 'crimes' committed by Mazarin, which is valuable as it demonstrates the extent some people of Paris were willing to go to show their resentment of the Cardinal
- the source was published in 1650, two years into the Frondes, which is valuable as it is able to provide a holistic overview of the failings of Mazarin from the perspective of one of his enemies
- the purpose of the source is intended to mock Mazarin, so the value of the source may be questioned as its intention isn't necessarily to be factual
- the tone of the source is very critical of Mazarin. Whilst the source intentionally exaggerates Mazarin's crimes this can still be valuable as it shows the level of dissatisfaction felt towards Mazarin.

Content and argument

- the source suggests that Mazarin is to blame for the Fronde as he failed to secure peace with Spain. This is valuable as the continued war with Spain between 1648–1659 was a key source of tension in France
- the source suggests that Mazarin was enriching himself at the extent of the state and this was causing resentment in France. This is valuable as Mazarin did amass a large personal fortune during his time as Chief Minister
- the source suggests that all the parlements of France blame Mazarin for disorder in the country, which is valuable as Frondes did break out across the country following the eruption of Paris in August 1648
- however, the source blames the Frondes entirely on Mazarin, which limits the value of the source as the political situation in France was far too complex to have a single author.

Section B

- 0 2** To what extent was Louis XIV's invasion of the Spanish Netherlands in 1667 caused by his dynastic ambitions?

[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 supporting the view that Louis XIV's invasion of the Spanish Netherlands in 1667 was caused by his dynastic ambitions might include:

- Louis XIV proclaimed publicly that the invasion of the Spanish Netherlands was necessary to put right the will of Philip IV, which had disinherited his wife, Marie Theresa, in favour of her three-year-old half-brother
- Louis XIV stated that his intentions in the Spanish Netherlands were purely to defend his family's succession rights, which he was expected to do as King of France and was a long-term foreign policy objective. This was consistent in the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle where a key priority was negotiating a partition of the Empire from Leopold
- Louis XIV may have been convinced by his lawyers that Marie Theresa still had a claim to the Spanish throne as Philip IV never paid her dowry. Under the terms of their marriage contract, Marie Theresa would only renounce her claim to the Spanish throne in exchange for a dowry
- an ancient Flemish Law was used by Louis XIV's lawyers to justify Louis XIV's dynastic claims to the Spanish Netherlands through his wife. The Law of Devolution implied that when a man had married for a second time, his property should go to the children of his first marriage upon his death.

Arguments challenging the view that Louis XIV's invasion of the Spanish Netherlands in 1667 was caused by his dynastic ambitions might include:

- it remained a long-term objective of French foreign policy to secure the North-Eastern frontier. This was especially true considering the lack of natural frontiers and previous territorial incursions in this theatre
- Louis XIV wanted to prevent Habsburg encirclement. If the Spanish Netherlands were later to pass to Austria this would be seen as damaging for France so securing Marie Theresa's claim was strategically very important
- the death of Philip IV of Spain had left the ailing child Charles II on the Spanish throne, with his mother acting as regent. This provided the ideal opportunity to exploit this temporary vulnerability; Spanish troop numbers had been falling post-1661
- the Dutch and the English were engaged in the Second Anglo-Dutch War and were, therefore, assumed not likely to intervene. This was important as any invasion of the Spanish Netherlands could appear threatening to the Dutch.

Students may argue that the War of Devolution is a pure example of aggressive opportunism disguised by dynastic claims. Alternatively, students may argue that Louis XIV's main priority was to defend his dynastic interests and that the Spanish Netherlands provided the first opportunity for this during the personal reign.

0 3 'In the years after 1685, Madame de Maintenon played an important role in Louis XIV's decision-making.'

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 supporting the view that in the years after 1685, Madame de Maintenon played an important role in Louis XIV's decision-making may include:

- Maintenon was able to influence political decisions and enabled her allies to achieve high-status positions. She was instrumental in the appointment of her friend Louis Antoine de Noailles as Archbishop of Paris in 1695 and Michel Chamillart as Controller General of Finance in 1699
- Conseil d'état meetings and consultations sometimes occurred in Madame de Maintenon's apartments, where she met Louis each evening. She sometimes discussed statecraft and supported Louis' actions, such as accepting Carlos' will in 1700. She also encouraged anti-Jansenism action, such as the destruction of Port Royal
- Maintenon convinced Louis XIV to provide financial aid for her pet projects. Maintenon secured 1.4 million livres to design her school at Saint Cyr – for which daughters of impoverished noble men were eligible to attend. She was the school's director general from 1686
- Maintenon encouraged Louis XIV to legitimise his illegitimate sons following the succession crisis of 1711.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years after 1685, Madame de Maintenon played an important role in Louis XIV's decision-making may include:

- Louis never relaxed his control over government or altered any major political decision based on Madame de Maintenon's advice. All important decisions, such as legitimising his illegitimate sons, whilst encouraged by Maintenon, were of his own making and due to dynastic necessity
- Louis XIV's Jesuit Confessor had already instilled in him the need for sin atonement so it is questionable whether changes experienced by the King of France, such as his return to religion post-1685, can be attributed to his second marriage
- the idea of Madame de Maintenon's excessive manipulation of Louis XIV stems from the writings of Liselotte, Louis XIV's sister-in-law. Liselotte was known to be jealous of Madame de Maintenon and has been criticised for exaggerating her influence
- there were also others that influenced Louis' decisions so it is important not to exaggerate Maintenon's role on advising the King. Pope Clement, Pontchartrain and Louvois all played an influencing role in the later years of Louis XIV's reign.

Students may argue that Maintenon played an important role in Louis XIV's decision-making and that she was instrumental to some of the strategic changes that took place in France post-1685. Alternatively, students may argue that perception outweighed reality and that Maintenon only ever provided encouragement for decisions Louis XIV intended on making himself.

0	4	‘The Peace of Ryswick in 1697 strengthened France’s international position.’ 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 supporting the view that the Peace of Ryswick in 1697 strengthened France's international position might include:

- the Peace allowed Louis to retain Strasbourg, which was a key prize needed to defend France's northern border from the Dutch and of immense symbolic value to Louis' prestige. Strasbourg was also one of Louis XIV's key priorities when entering the Peace negotiations and believed to be worth sacrificing territory that was less strategically important in order to obtain control of the region. Louis' propaganda machine highlighted the retention of Strasbourg as a major success
- the Peace strengthened France's trading routes by restoring Pondicherry. The Spanish also accepted French control of the western part of Hispaniola which increased French presence in North America
- 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, were a strategic move. Louis XIV wanted to enhance France's international position by leading Carlos II to consider leaving his territories to France in their entirety, something he later achieves.

Arguments challenging the view that the Peace of Ryswick in 1697 strengthened 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 which weakened Louis XIV's international position
- 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 recognise 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. Louis was losing the war, of which the cost was immense, so he was already negotiating from a position of weakness.

Students may decide to agree or disagree with the statement. Students who agree that the Peace of Ryswick strengthened Louis XIV's international position may argue that the acquisition of Strasbourg and favourable terms with the Spanish were strategically the most important to France, so the benefits outweighed any concessions made during the peace negotiation. Alternatively, students may argue that the terms of the Peace imply that Louis XIV lost the war, and this would be incredibly damaging for the international reputation of France.