

## Candidate 2 – Part B: Historical Sources

The evidence for this candidate was placed within the following mark ranges for each question of this course assessment component.

### **Question 23: How fully does Source C explain the interests of fifteenth-century Italian humanists?**

The candidate was awarded **10 marks** because they were awarded 3 marks for interpretation, 5 marks for wider contextual development and 2 marks for historical interpretations.

#### ***Interpretation***

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because he/she has correctly identified three relevant points from the source and demonstrated understanding of the selected evidence. In this case the candidate handles the interpretation of the source evidence with confidence and fluency. For example, he/she writes: 'Source C describes the 'intellectual elite' who translated classical texts and embraced 'all fields of knowledge'. The multi-faceted nature of humanist interests is important, as it sparked humanist education in all areas...Educating the elite, as Source C says, of every city made sure that...the next generation of rulers were humanists' (1 mark). The candidate has selected and interpreted the main point made in lines 3 to 7 of Source C, while choosing to avoid a lengthy direct quotation. The script continues: 'As well as teaching rhetoric, humanists like Da Feltre and Da Verona were described by Plumb as crucial to the intellectual development of Renaissance states'. The reference to the historian Plumb means that this could be credited as either wider contextual development or historical interpretation, but since elsewhere the candidate has two other valid historical references, this has been credited as wider contextual development. Two further interpretation points are achieved with the comment: 'Second, the source describes how humanists engaged in classical revival, translating and distributing Latin and Greek texts to gain a greater understanding of the past' (1 mark) and 'Third, the source explores the way humanists then applied classical knowledge to the present, believing their time to be a 'renewal of classical cities' (1 mark).

#### ***Wider contextual development***

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because there is a relevant reference to Bruni's humanist 'History of the Florentine People' (1 mark) as well as the reference to Da Feltre mentioned above (1 mark). Having considered the source, the candidate continues: 'However, the source does not mention how this knowledge was not just used to 'praise[d] their own time'. Through teaching rhetoric and persuasion as the source describes, humanists influenced rulers. They also directly contributed to governance, such as Ficino in Florence' (1 mark). The answer continues 'Machiavelli and Guicciardini as well as Castiglione were humanists who were not just interested in the academic values of classical texts, but also wanted to change the present' (1 mark, since all three humanists are treated collectively. Had the candidate made separate points about each one, then a further mark could have been awarded). There is one final wider

contextual development point regarding the development of Neoplatonism. This is made at the beginning of the answer, and repeated, with some development at the end but can only be credited once (1 mark).

### ***Historical interpretations***

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because there is relevant reference to two historians. At the beginning of the answer the candidate refers to JR Hale, commenting correctly on his image of the vital 'scholar's lamp', since humanism was first and foremost intellectual (1 mark). There is also a reference to Knox, who describes how humanists broke the theological tradition (1 mark).

At the end of the answer the candidate provides a brief answer to the question asked: 'Source C explores and explains the initial interests of 15<sup>th</sup> century humanism, but does not go far enough to fully explain civic humanism and involvement in government or Neo-Platonist ideology. While it is good practice to address the question at the beginning or end of an answer, there are no marks allocated to this.

**Question 24: Evaluate the usefulness of Source D as evidence of the priorities of the Italian princes in their princely courts.**

The candidate was awarded **10 marks** because he/she was awarded 1 mark for provenance, 3 marks for interpretation, 4 marks for wider contextual development and 2 marks for historical interpretations.

***Provenance***

The candidate was awarded **1 mark for provenance**. After some irrelevant points, the candidate makes a single provenance point which comes at the end of the paper.

The following point from the candidate is not credited as the candidate is told that Montefeltro was Count of Urbino; more is needed to be awarded a mark for authorship: 'Source D is useful to a large extent as evidence of princely priorities during the Renaissance, showing the use of art to build a city's reputation. Federico da Montefeltro is a very useful source, since he was ruling Urbino at the time.'

The following point is also not credited because the references to Mantua and Milan are not sufficiently relevant or specific: 'This gives him direct insight into court life, and specifically the priorities of princes since he was one. His priorities, to some extent shown in the source, are therefore direct evidence, although only from one court and so not necessarily useful in terms of Milan or Mantua or others.'

The following point is insufficiently specific at this point but the candidate does return to this at the end of the answer so these comments can be taken with the final comment (which is credited): 'However, the nature of the source as a letter to one specific person limits it; Federico is only discussing architecture and given the letter is written to an architect will probably exaggerate his concern for that area. As a result the author of the source makes it useful, but the purpose of the letter itself reveals its limited evidence of broader priorities.'

The candidate is credited for the following final comment: 'Therefore the source presents useful evidence about the role of classical antiquity and architecture, but only focuses on those narrow areas. Some of Federico's other priorities, similar to other princes in Milan and Mantua, would never be admitted by him, especially to an architect he wanted to work for him, and so due to the biased nature of the source itself the evidence presented is somewhat limited'. There is clear reference to the purpose of the source, since it is accepted that Federico was determined to employ Laurana to build his new palace. This point is credited (1 mark).

### ***Interpretation***

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because he/she identifies and interprets three separate points from the source. 'First, the way Federico valued multi-talented people, stating that there are 'certain skills worthy of honour and praise' is evidence of the individually focused Italian princes, who surrounded themselves with people who had those skills' (1 mark). Note that the candidate then expands on this interpretation by using wider contextual development: 'Federico himself tried to emulate different skills, initially a mercenary condottieri but when he became duke expanding his interests into academia and the arts' (1 wider contextual development mark).

'Second, Federico expresses his keen interest in the classical past, and renewing Urbino's status the way it was then. This interest was common across the princely courts and further in Renaissance times, and so the source is useful evidence of how Italian princes prioritised regaining classical splendour' (1 mark). Again the candidate consolidates this interpretation with a single wider contextual development mark from 'in Mantua'...to 'humanist Da Feltre' (1 wider contextual development mark)

'The third point from the source is about the role of art in regaining that splendour. Federico suggests that architecture is the key, and making his city attractive will regain its status' (1 mark).

### ***Wider contextual development***

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because four separate points are made. Two of these are developments of interpretation points (see above). A further relevant point is made: 'The first major limitation in the content of the source is that it only discusses artistic skills. As well as the liberal arts, military prowess was highly valued...from military force' (1 mark). There is a final wider contextual development point made on the final pages: 'Another limitation of the source is that he would never advertise his priorities as being about his own weaknesses. In order to appear legitimate when he gained power by force, Federico had to seem in control' (1 mark).

### ***Historical interpretations***

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because there are two relevant references to historians' interpretations towards the end of the answer: 'Described by Cole as 'regularly presented as diplomatic gifts', art in the princely courts also had a political function' (1 mark) and 'Mateer argues that in Mantua the Gonzagas gained legitimacy through appearing cultured (through art) and strategic marriages' (1 mark).

Both at the beginning of the answer, and at the end of the response, the candidate attempts to evaluate the usefulness of the source. Although there are no marks awarded for this, it is difficult to achieve provenance marks without including evaluation.