



---

# A-level HISTORY 7042/2F

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

---

Mark scheme

June 2022

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](http://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 © 2022 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 Louis XIV's policy of Reunions.

**[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

- Source A is from a diary written by Vauban, who was Marshal of France and had travelled extensively along France's frontier. His advice on the security of France's borders is very valuable due to his position as Marshal of France and it would have been used by Louis XIV to inform his next act of foreign policy. Vauban is well placed to comment on matters of foreign policy and he is recording his thoughts in his diary
- it was written in 1678, at the end of the Dutch War which directly preceded Louis XIV's policy of Reunions. It is valuable as it helps the historian understand why there was a need for further aggression on the north eastern frontier despite France concluding the Treaty of Nijmegen in 1679 and claiming it a victory
- students may also argue that the date of the source limits its value when considering the policy of Reunions – Nijmegen is yet to be concluded so, on the surface, this source can only provide a limited insight into future plans to acquire further territory on the north eastern frontier
- the purpose of Source A is merely to record Vauban's observations of potential weaknesses on the French frontier, which adds value to the source as it is a reliable account of what Vauban perceives to be threats to future French security and the need for the Reunion policy to be enacted. This is demonstrated by the informative tone of the source, which reflects its nature as a diary entry.

### Content and argument

- the source is valuable when studying Louis XIV's policy of Reunions as it states that 'weaknesses can be found on the north eastern frontier'. It is true that there were gateways such as Zweibrucken, where Habsburg troops had crossed the Rhine to attack France during the Dutch War
- the source states that 'Luxembourg poses a threat' which is valuable as it was a Spanish territory in 1678. This suggests that it would be a key territory on France's north eastern frontier that would need fortifying after the Dutch War concluded
- it is true that the free city of Strasbourg was a major weakness for Louis XIV as, without it, any sense of pré-carré was lost, making the source valuable as evidence of why Louis prioritises Strasbourg during the Reunions
- Vauban suggests that 'conquest of Strasbourg' is worth fighting a further war, which could limit the value of the source as France was economically drained as a result of the Dutch War so Vauban's judgement here could be questioned.

**Source B: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:****Provenance, tone and emphasis**

- the author of the source lived at the palace of Versailles in the 1680s, which is valuable as it is when Louis XIV's policy of Reunions took place
- the source is a memoir from a Brandenburg diplomat which is valuable as it makes him well placed to comment on the policy of Reunions from the perspective of one of France's former allies
- as a foreign ambassador, he would not be privy to the inner details of the royal council, so his ability to comment on the policy of reunions should not be overestimated. Students may argue that this limits the value of the source
- the tone seems very critical of France, which could reflect the fact that it was written when relations between France and Brandenburg had deteriorated. The hostile nature of the source could limit its value to a historian studying the policy of Reunions.

**Content and argument**

- the source details the actions of Louis XIV's Secretary of State, Colbert de Croissy following the Treaty of Nijmegen. This is valuable as Colbert de Croissy did indeed play a crucial role when it came to developing Louis XIV's policy of Reunions – he replaced Pomponne who was considered not to be ruthless enough
- the source states that the 'vague clauses pertaining to Alsace' under the Treaty of Nijmegen were used to establish the Chambres of Reunion. This is valuable as it provides the reader with an understanding of the legal ambiguities surrounding previous peace treaties that Louis XIV was able to take advantage of under his policy of Reunions
- the source suggests that the conditions surrounding the Reunions 'favourable to France', which is valuable as it demonstrates why there may have been tensions mounting in Europe in response to a general suspicion of French corruption during the policy of Reunions
- the source is clearly critical of Colbert de Croissy and some of the information is quite vague. For example, the claim that de Croissy made 'negotiations with public ministers who had opposing interests that were not favourable to France could limit the value of the source as it seems too much like a broad generalisation.

**Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:****Provenance, tone and emphasis**

- the source is written by Louvois, Louis XIV's Minister for War. This provides a valuable insight as the author is well placed to comment on the policy of Reunions. Louvois was known to have had a substantial influence on Louis XIV when it comes to foreign policy
- the source is a letter to Louis XIV from his Minister for War, providing information on the occupation of Strasbourg. This is valuable as the information Louvois provides regarding the policy of Reunions would need to be accurate, at least to a certain extent, if he is informing the King
- Louvois is writing from Strasbourg, so is able to provide a first-hand account of the French occupation which makes the source valuable
- Louvois was a strong advocate of using forceful action during the policy of Reunions, he would want to portray the occupation in a positive light. The tone of the source could imply that he is exaggerating the success of the occupation for his own benefit, which limits the value of the source. Alternatively, students may argue that Louvois' gross exaggeration here on the success of the occupation in Strasbourg actually adds value to the source as it implies that the occupation of this city was controversial.

### **Content and argument**

- the source details the successful occupation of Strasbourg, which had previously been an Imperial Free City. Strasbourg was distinct from other Reunion territories as there was no previously legal claim, which makes the source valuable as it implies that the Reunions were not simply a defensive policy
- the source suggests that the people of Strasbourg were 'happy with the change of rule' which may limit the value of the source as it is unlikely to be accurate. Strasbourg was a protestant city, so it is unlikely that all of the citizens would be happy with French occupation
- the source also acknowledges that defences need to be built in the city in case the bourgeois citizens retaliate, which is valuable as it does hint at a more balanced view of how the policy of Reunions would have been viewed by the people of Strasbourg
- the source reassures Louis XIV that the north eastern frontier is now secured by the occupation of Strasbourg. This is valuable as Strasbourg had long been a key weakness on the north eastern frontier – without it French control of Alsace was incomplete. This suggests that the source provides an insight into the success of the Reunion Policy now that France has acquired Strasbourg and secured the north eastern frontier.

**Section B**

**0 2** 'There were significant changes in Louis XIV's religious policies in the 1670s.'

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 there were significant changes in Louis XIV's religious policies in the 1670s might include:**

- Louis XIV's relationship towards Rome deteriorated in the 1670s when he declared that the régale would be extended to the whole of France. Louis XIV was threatened with excommunication because of his actions towards Rome in 1676
- Louis XIV introduced new measures in an attempt to bribe Huguenots into converting to Catholicism. He introduced cash payments from the 'treasury of conversion' in 1676
- Louis XIV's persecution of the Huguenots had intensified by the end of the 1670s. The conclusion of the Dutch War where Louis XIV has targeted 'heretics' abroad, resulted in a more robust policy towards protestants at home
- in 1679 the Duchess of Longville died, which removed a powerful protector of Jansenism and signalling a change in Louis XIV's religious policy. Louis XIV sacked his Jansenist foreign minister Pomponne and dispersed the last male residents from Port Royal.

**Arguments challenging the view that there were significant changes in Louis XIV's religious policies in the 1670s might include:**

- Louis adopted an overtly anti-papal position in the 1660s, which saw him threaten to invade the papal state of Avignon after Corsican guards in Rome fired shots at the coach of the French Ambassador. This anti-papal position merely continued into the 1670s
- Pope Innocent XI's predecessors were less inclined to challenge Louis XIV, so any deterioration in the relationship between France and Rome could be attributed to Innocent XI's desire to stem Louis XIV's power rather than a change in religious policy
- whilst Louis XIV's policy towards the Huguenots begins to intensify at the end of the 1670s, it is not until the 1680s that he adopts more aggressive methods such as his Dragonnades policy
- Louis XIV's desire to be The Most Christian King and to root out Heresy was a long-term objective, and one that remains consistent throughout his reign. This can be seen in his policy towards the Jansenists as, whilst his policy intensifies at the end of the 1670s, it can be argued that this was merely a continuation of his policies in the early 1660s.

There were some significant changes in Louis XIV's religious policy in the 1670s, especially towards the end of the decade. The ending of the Dutch War between 1678–79 allowed Louis XIV to turn his attentions towards his domestic policy, specifically his aim of targeting heresy in France. However, it is debatable how significant these changes really were and whether they really mark a new direction for Louis XIV's religious policy. It can be argued that Louis XIV's fundamental religious priorities remained the same during the course of his reign, and that it was merely circumstance which led him to prioritise different elements of his religious policy during the 1670s.

**0 3** 'Louis XIV was responsible for the outbreak of the War of the Spanish Succession in 1701.'

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 Louis XIV was responsible for the outbreak of the War of the Spanish Succession in 1701 might include:**

- Louis XIV accepted the will of Charles II on behalf of his grandson in 1700 knowing that this would increase tension in Europe. Louis had previously negotiated two partition treaties with William III to prevent this happening so would be fully aware of the consequences
- Louis XIV announced that his grandson Philippe d'Anjou retained his claim to the French throne and had this registered in the Parlement of Paris in 1701. This was despite Charles II's will forbidding any union of the French and Spanish kingdoms. This was seen as provocative by the leaders of England, the Dutch Republic and the Holy Roman Empire
- Louis XIV sent troops to occupy Dutch garrisons in the Spanish Netherlands to force them to acknowledge his grandson as the King of Spain. This broke the terms of the Treaty of Ryswick
- Louis XIV alienated William III of England by ordering his grandson to grant the Asiento to the French rather than the English, in addition to naming the son of James II as the legitimate King of England.

**Arguments challenging the view that Louis XIV was responsible for the outbreak of the War of the Spanish Succession in 1701 might include:**

- tensions were already extremely high in Europe before the death of Charles II of Spain, who did not have a direct male heir to the Spanish Empire. Tensions were further increased following the unfortunate death of Joseph Ferdinand whom Louis XIV and William III had both agreed on as a possible candidate during the first partition treaty
- Louis XIV had attempted to avoid war by negotiating partition treaties before the death of Charles II. During these partition treaties he looked mainly for small gains for France, and was willing to concede the majority of the Spanish inheritance. When the will named his grandson as the sole heir he had no choice but to accept the terms of the will
- Emperor Leopold provoked Louis XIV and the war as well. Leopold rejected the Second Partition Treaty even though it offered him so much, despite neither of his sons having a Spanish Mother. Leopold also marched troops into Italy in 1701 and refused to acknowledge Philippe as the King of Spain. France did not declare war until 1702
- the formation of the Grand Alliance in September 1701 contributed greatly to the outbreak of the War of the Spanish Succession.

Students may argue that Louis XIV made inevitable the very war he dreaded. Whilst tensions were indeed heightened by Charles II's will, which left Louis XIV's grandson the entirety of the Spanish inheritance, the war did not break out until 1701. Therefore, students may argue that it was a series of blunders made by Louis XIV following his acceptance of Charles II's will that resulted in the outbreak of war. Alternatively, students may consider the opposing argument, by suggesting that the formation of the Grand Alliance and the provocative actions of Emperor Leopold resulted in Louis XIV taking defensive actions between the years 1700–1701.

**0 4** To what extent was Louis XIV's authority in France weakened in the years 1704 to 1715?

**[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 authority in France was weakened in the years 1704 to 1715 might include:**

- Louis XIV's control of France can be questioned during the later years of his reign. His attempt to tax the nobility by introducing the dixième in 1710 saw ongoing defiance, suggesting his authority was weakening. There was also open defiance from the Parlement of Paris in 1713 when Louis XIV attempted to register the papal bull Unigenitus
- Louis XIV lost control of provincial France during the later years of his reign. There were urban riots in Amiens in 1704 and 1711 and Marseilles, Arles and Dijon in 1709
- Louis XIV experienced a succession crisis post-1711 where within three years he lost a son, two grandsons and a great grandson. His attempt to legitimise his illegitimate children was unsuccessful, and his plan to restrict the power of Philippe, duc d'Orléans, also failed
- Louis XIV's authority weakened during the War of the Spanish Succession. Crushing defeats at Blenheim in 1704 and Oudenarde in 1708 shattered Louis XIV's aura of invincibility and damaged French prestige at home.

**Arguments challenging the view that Louis XIV's authority in France was weakened in the years 1704 to 1715 might include:**

- Louis XIV remained in charge of the government of France during the later period of his reign, and there is evidence that he strengthened his control in some areas of government. For example, Louis XIV was his own War Minister during the War of the Spanish Succession
- despite royal debt rising, Versailles was still in splendour and foreign embassies were still received with no expense spared
- Louis also demonstrated strong control of government outside of Paris by dealing with crises, including the quashing of riots in Lyon in 1709
- France was never completely defeated during the War of the Spanish Succession. Whilst Louis XIV may have surrendered territory at Utrecht in 1713 he also secured a substantial amount. The prize of securing recognition of his grandson as the King of Spain secured the Bourbon dynasty, which suggests that Louis authority remained unchecked.

Students may argue that Louis XIV's authority in France weakened towards the end of his reign as his foreign policy had disastrous domestic consequences. Not only did Louis XIV's international authority weaken during the War of the Spanish Succession, but the cost of the war highlighted his failings in governing France from the centre. Alternatively, students may argue that given the context of seventeenth century France, Louis ability to maintain a sense of authority is very impressive. Especially in the face of an international coalition such as the Grand Alliance, making maintaining authority at home even more difficult.