

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/53**

Paper 5c The Reign of Henry VIII, 1509–1547

**May/June 2018**

**MARK SCHEME**

Maximum Mark: 60

---

**Published**

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

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

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2018 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

IGCSE™ is a registered trademark.

This syllabus is approved for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

---

This document consists of **14** printed pages.

**Generic Marking Principles**

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:**

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:**

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:**

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:**

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:**

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

**Special Subject: Source-based Question**

*These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2016–18 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.*

**Introduction**

- (a) This question is designed to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.
- (b) Examiners will be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.
- (c) The Band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result not all answers fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases, a 'best-fit' approach will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (d) In marking an answer examiners will first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

**Question (a)****Band 3: 8–10 marks**

The answer will make full use of both documents and will be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues will be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

**Band 2: 4–7 marks**

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the focus of the argument (depending upon whether similarity or difference is asked) with some attention to the alternative. Direct comparison of content, themes and issues is to be expected although, at the lower end of the Band, there may be a tendency to treat the documents separately with most or all of the comparison and analysis being left to the end. Again, towards the lower end, there may be some paraphrasing. Clear explanation of how the documents agree or differ is to be expected but insights into why are less likely. A sound critical sense is to be expected especially at the upper end of the Band.

**Band 1: 1–3 marks**

Treatment of the documents will be partial, certainly incomplete and possibly fragmentary. Only the most obvious differences/similarities will be detected and there will be a considerable imbalance (differences may be picked up but not similarities and vice versa). Little is to be expected by way of explanation of how the documents show differences/similarities, and the work will be characterised by largely uncritical paraphrasing.

**Band 0: 0 marks**

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

**Question (b)****Band 4: 16–20 marks**

The answer will treat the documents as a set and will make very effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It will be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material will be handled confidently with strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge will be demonstrated. The material deployed will be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument will be well structured. Historical concepts and vocabulary will be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected.

**Band 3: 11–15 marks**

The answer will treat the documents as a set and make good use of them although, depending on the form of the question, not necessarily in equal detail. There may, however, be some omissions and gaps. A good understanding of the question will be demonstrated. There will be a good sense of argument and analysis within a secure and planned structure. Supporting use of contextual knowledge is to be expected and will be deployed in appropriate range and depth. Some clear signs of a critical sense will be on show although critical evaluation of the documents may not always be especially well developed and may be absent at the lower end of the Band. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations may be expected. The answer will demonstrate a good understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary.

**Band 2: 6–10 marks**

There will be some regard to the documents as a set and a fair coverage, although there will be gaps and one or two documents may be unaccountably neglected, or especially at the lower end of the Band, ignored altogether. The demands of the question will be understood at least in good part and an argument will be attempted. This may be undeveloped and/or insufficiently supported in places. Analysis will be at a modest level and narrative is likely to take over in places with a consequent lack of focus. Some of the work will not go beyond paraphrasing. Supporting contextual knowledge will be deployed but unevenly. Any critical sense will be limited; formal critical evaluation is rarely to be expected; use of historical concepts will be unsophisticated.

**Band 1: 1–5 marks**

The answer will treat the documents as a set only to a limited extent. Coverage will be very uneven; there will be considerable omissions with whole sections left unconsidered. Some understanding of the question will be demonstrated but any argument will be undeveloped and poorly supported. Analysis will appear rarely, narrative will predominate and focus will be very blurred. In large part the answer will depend upon unadorned paraphrasing. Critical sense and evaluation, even at an elementary level, is unlikely whilst understanding of historical concepts will be at a low level. The answer may be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished.

**Band 0: 0 marks**

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

**Special Subject: Essay Question**

*These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2016–18 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.*

**Introduction**

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and should be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners will give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They will be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit will be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners will use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It goes without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners will also bear in mind that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 4 mark.
- (e) The Band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners will first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

**Band 5: 25–30 marks**

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this Band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the other criteria for this Band, limited or no use of such sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

**Band 4: 19–24 marks**

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to at least some relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the criteria for this Band, very limited or no use of these sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

**Band 3: 13–18 marks**

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is a possibility. Candidates should be credited for having used such sources rather than penalised for not having done so.

**Band 2: 7–12 marks**

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

**Band 1: 1–6 marks**

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; the answer is likely to include unsupported generalisations, and there will be some vagueness and irrelevance. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources are not to be expected. The answer may be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

**Band 0: 0 marks**

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.



## Section A

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p><b>To what extent does Document E corroborate the view of the rights of the King expressed in Document C?</b></p> <p>Similarities – Both Document C and Document E deal with royal authority. Document C says that the King should be the head of the same people he rules as king, even if they are in the Church. Document E gives a direct command to all the leading churchmen to accept his authority as head of the Church. Both argue that this authority comes from God. Document E argues that it is God’s law that Henry is head, while Document C offers a more elaborate argument that princes rule with god’s authority and that authority must be over the Church.</p> <p>Differences – Document C does not make the argument that the King, and not the Pope, should be the head of the Church directly. Indeed, it might be said that quoting Paul might refer to the power of the Pope, but that is not the intention. It is an argument firmly based on the royal position as head of the Church but does not say why the Pope should not so be seen. Document E takes it almost as read that the King is the head of the Church and focuses on why the Pope is not – because ‘there was no such holiness in Rome’ and many of his laws go against God’s laws.</p> <p>Origin – Gardiner is not an ideologue, but in the tradition of bishops accepting the authority of the King. There is no suggestion of doctrinal justification as with Cranmer’s views of the efficacy of ceremony or moral judgements about papal legislation. The focus is more narrowly based, as might be expected from this Erastian figure on power and authority. Cranmer is more concerned to see the King’s rights in terms of replacing what he considers morally, legally and doctrinally unacceptable authority, as might be expected from more of a committed reformer. Document C is a treatise on obedience. Document E is a letter to the King, so the audience and tone is different. Document E does not need to argue a case for royal authority; his audience accepts that Document C is offering justification at an early stage in the Henrician reformation.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the break with Rome, 1529–1536, was determined more by secular rather than religious considerations? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E).</b></p> <p>Document A – The author is the well-educated and urbane ambassador poking fun at the more ridiculous claims made by Norfolk about the basis of royal authority. The thrust of these claims seems to be secular authority – the Pope still has jurisdiction over heresy. The right of Empire is an important concept and contextual knowledge will see this jurisdictional self-sufficiency as an important concept later, for example in the Act of Appeals. Arguing that the ancient British ruler was an Emperor of Britain was important in claiming that he, the King, had inherited the right not to be subject to any authority outside the Kingdom. The argument is about ‘authority’ being usurped (the subtext is taxation and legal jurisdiction). There is little to suggest very much concern for spiritual matters in this reported tirade.</p> <p>Document B – This concerns not so much spiritual matters, but taxation and money taken out of the country and the costs incurred in meeting Annates or payments made by newly promoted church office holders. These have caused practical hardships, but they are also described as ‘unlawful’. Parliament’s authority is invoked suggesting that English authority can override that of the Pope. The subject matter is secular but there are some implications about the basis of papal authority. The context too is secular, with pressure being applied when the King needs a divorce.</p> <p>Document C – This is firmly secular as might be expected from Gardiner and about the religious basis for secular authority, not the break with Rome. Many had thought that English Kings had rights that had been usurped in the past, but this did not mean that there should be doctrinal change. Wolsey had dissolved monasteries, but had not led any doctrinal reformation.</p> <p>Document D – This is a mixture of secular and religious concerns. There is waste of resources claimed and immorality but here a link is made with <i>true doctrine</i>. It hints at the spread of ideas about whether good works can bring about salvation. It is predominantly though not entirely about management and behaviour but, by this time, there are wider implications. The suppression of the smaller houses had precedents and could be seen as managerial ‘tidying up’ but, in the light of later developments, it does have religious significance. The document is justifying actions which may have more to do with the secular motive of gaining money for the Crown than is apparent here and also the reformist element may be stronger than the limited reference suggests given the framer of the act.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>Document E - Cranmer had protestant views and in this document the thrust is towards the iniquities of Rome meaning that the break was justified. There are some justifications; for example, it was not God's word that 'the Pope was God's Vicar on earth', and this has an important meaning in that there was no Biblical justification for papal authority. The lack of holiness in Rome touches behaviour rather than doctrine, but is different from the financial and legal arguments in Document B. There is a much clearer religious argument in the view of ceremonies and their lack of importance in taking away sin. Contextual knowledge might be shown to explain the importance in the light of theological arguments about absolution and indulgences. By August 1536, the break was more advanced and the letter from the Archbishop to the King in the aftermath of the Pilgrimage of Grace may be to encourage progress.</p>	

**Section B**

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><b>How effectively did Henry VIII establish his authority in the years 1509–1513?</b></p> <p>AO1/2 – Candidates could discuss the situation in 1509, when there was some resentment at Henry VIII’s policies and indications of disloyalty. Henry seemed something of a Renaissance figure – a champion in all sports, of a notable versatility, highly accomplished, a scholar and a lover of letters – so this could be seen to have strengthened the authority of the Crown. The disgrace and execution of Dudley and Empson could be seen as a determined stroke to break with the past and re-engage the sympathies of the nobility for the Crown, or a sign that royal authority needed concessions and the scapegoating of unpopular royal advisers.</p> <p>The pomp and festivities of the young king's marriage with Katharine of Aragon encouraged a view of a monarch of international standing, but the failure to produce a living male heir was a concern, and the execution of Edmund de la Pole in 1513 was a sign of ruthless authority and some insecurity.</p> <p>The financial situation which Henry VIII inherited helped to establish his authority, but also allowed him to turn to a revival of the wars against France, perhaps to stress his authority as a traditional warrior king. This, in turn, divided his council. Initial campaigning was unsuccessful, and though alliance with Maximilian and Ferdinand increased his standing, the failure in Guienne was dangerously redolent of the reign of Henry VI. By 1513, though, Henry had achieved the military successes which bolstered his authority at the battle of the Spurs and the capture of Therouanne, and at Flodden against the Scots. The possible dominance of aristocratic advice was balanced by the rise of Wolsey.</p> <p>In one perspective, Henry had established a different kind of rule with greater personal charisma, prestige and military successes, which tied the nobility to the Crown without allowing them to dominate policy. In another perspective, he had failed to achieve the stability of a male heir, which would have bolstered his authority, and shown some signs of insecurity with executions and tying authority too much to ongoing diplomatic success, a risky strategy.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>How important was preparation for the succession in the politics of the period 1540 to 1547?</b></p> <p>AO1 – Henry’s reign had been much concerned with the succession. The birth of a son in 1537 seemed to ensure the survival of the line. However, Henry’s ill health made for concerns. The politics of the 1540s were dominated by factionalism. In 1540, Cromwell fell from power. Rival factions, such as the reformists led by Archbishop Cranmer and Edward Seymour, wanted political and religious reform, whereas conservatives, headed by Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk and Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, wanted to retain a form of Catholicism. Cromwell’s fall and the marriage between Henry and Catherine Howard had seen the ascendancy of the Norfolk faction, but the fall of Catherine, engineered by Cranmer, and the marriage to Katherine Parr changed the dynamic. However, in 1543, there was a plot against Cranmer which looked as if it was going to be successful but was foiled by Henry. Gardiner was imprisoned in 1544 but released. A conservative plot against the Queen failed in 1546, and the reformists were left in the ascendant 1546–1547 following the rise of Sir Anthony Denny and the successes of Hertford in Scotland. Unwise boasting about how his uncle dominated the young King after Henry’s death led to his execution and the arrest of Norfolk. Henry’s will, making arrangements for 16 executors, omitted Gardiner who had been excluded from court in 1546, and gave the balance of power to the reformists.</p> <p>AO2 – There is dispute about how far factionalism was allowed to get out of hand, but Henry took a firm line with the Succession Act of 1544. This Act and a will of 1545 ensured Edward would be heir and named Mary and Elizabeth as his successors. To make sure that Edward succeeded, Henry backed Edward Seymour, and Gardiner was removed from the Privy Council. The link between succession and religion lies in the education of the young king as a protestant. Candidates should weigh the importance of the succession in the factionalism, and the King’s decisions in dealing with it, against other considerations such as personal ambitions, the influence of his wives and religion.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p><b>'Its costs vastly outweighed its benefits.'</b> Discuss this view of Henry VIII's foreign policy in the 1540s.</p> <p>AO1 – The costs of campaigning on a large scale in France and the war in Scotland were over £1m; and, Boulogne cost £133000 to maintain. His foreign policy entailed subsidies of £430000 and forced loans of £110000. As well as obvious costs, there was the impact on inflation with unprecedentedly high levels of spending and coinage debasement. With large forces, perhaps 48000 men went to France in 1544, there were human costs: for example, the sinking of the Mary Rose and the brutalities of the rough wooing in Scotland. The cost to the monarchy in the long term should be considered given the volume of land sales which the war costs necessitated, and eroded the advantages accrued by the dissolution of the monasteries. The gains were temporary; the defeat of James V at Solway Moss might have brought about the 'British vision', seen by some historians as an aim, or at least increased links with and domination of Scotland, but both the treaty of Greenwich and the marriage between Edward and Mary were abortive, and the victory did not lead to permanent gains. The war against France did revive Henry's youthful ambitions, but the only real benefits were an eight-year hold on Boulogne confirmed in a treaty of 1546, and a renewal of a French pension which did not match the costs of the war.</p> <p>AO2 – Benefits in terms of long-term territorial gains or strengthening of the monarchy's hold on Scotland and Ireland to match the greater control of Wales in the 1540s, did not seem to follow. In the King's eyes, the benefits might have been: to reassert him as a major player on the European scene; to use the resources gained in the 1530s in traditional monarchical power politics; and, possibly, to reunite a divided nobility behind the traditional aims to dominate Scotland and claim the title to France. In terms of achieving a more united realm, boosting diplomatic prestige, gaining land or much military glory, the benefits seem more doubtful.</p>	30