
A-level HISTORY 7042/2C

Component 2C The Reformation in Europe, c1500–1564

Mark scheme

June 2019

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 Assessment Writer.

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

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

System Name	Description
?	Questionable or unclear comment or fact
^	Omission – of evidence or comment
Cross	Inaccurate fact
H Line	Incorrect or dubious comment or information
IR	Irrelevant material
SEEN_BIG	Use to mark blank pages or plans
Tick	Creditworthy comment or fact
On page comment	Use text box if necessary to exemplify other annotations and add further comment. Always provide a text box comment at the end of each answer.

Level of response marking instructions

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

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

Step 1 Determine a level

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

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

Step 2 Determine a mark

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

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

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

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

Component 2C The Reformation in Europe, c1500–1564

Section A

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the Catholic Reformation. **[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

- this is a criticism of a key body associated with the Counter or Catholic Reformation. Agrippa is clearly an opponent of the Inquisition and so the source has value in that his rejection of the methods of the Catholic Inquisition comes from a Catholic perspective
- the tone is sneering and dismissive, 'bloodthirsty vultures', no better than, 'thieves and robbers'. The value here is that we see the emotion with which critics of the Inquisition responded to the methods to counter heresy and how this is perceived as undermining the Church
- the emphasis is on the cruelty of the inquisitors who are prepared to use extortion. There is value in developing a picture of a corrupted institution; the Inquisition's fearsome reputation here derives from its authority to use torture and imprison without trial.

Content and argument

- Agrippa suggests that the Inquisition is acting illegally, 'without a lawful judge' and so there is value in the perception of a Church institution acting outside the law
- the source claims that Inquisitors are working towards the Pope, the justification of any methods used derives from papal authority
- the value may be undermined by the use of exaggeration. Despite its reputation the reality is that the Inquisition rarely used torture; its main purpose was to educate and bring people back into the Catholic fold
- the source gives the impression that fear is a key method of the Inquisition. People would confess to crimes they had not committed, 'never crossed their minds', in order to save themselves. The source has value in demonstrating the existence of Counter-Reformation tools preceding the Council of Trent.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- this is a report commissioned by Pope Paul III who had a reputation as a reforming Pontiff. There is value in showing a desire to confront criticisms levelled at the Church by Luther and other reformers and so re-establish the authority of the Church
- as it was not initially published, there is a suggestion that although reform was seen as necessary, the dangers of such a public acknowledgement might undermine Church authority. Therefore, Pope Paul accepted the report but did not want to introduce all the suggested changes at once

- the tone is one of honesty and transparency, ‘without any regard to your own interest’. The emphasis is on the pastoral function of the Church; particular attention is given to the role of the priest; this is valuable as it addresses some of the key Reformer criticism
- the date of the source is significant, Paul III became pope in 1534; the Reformers had momentum. Paul had been deeply affected by the Sack of Rome, 1527. He stated he wanted Church reform. There is value in that the source appears to show a desire to see abuses rectified but the failure to publish diminishes its value.

Content and argument

- there is an acknowledgement that the abuses identified are nothing new as these matters have ‘long-afflicted’ the Church. Therefore, there is some value in seeing the acceptance of well-established criticisms but the Catholic Church had done this in the past and so it was not ground breaking
- despite the apparent soul searching displayed, there is also value in showing the Church being in a state of denial with regard to the point concerning indulgences. This matter was at the heart of the Lutheran revolt, the emphasis here is not on questioning the practice itself but on limiting its use
- there is value in the recognition that these criticisms were eroding Church authority. The key ones being the loss of sight of the responsibility the Church has towards its followers and the corruption of power and money within Rome itself, e.g. the Renaissance Popes
- there is value in identifying the limitations of the content. Reform here is limited in scope to ‘diseases and remedies’. A criticism levelled by Luther was that such reform was half-hearted as it did not extend to theology.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- although this is a letter it is more of a template. The value of it is in showing why the Jesuits enjoyed a good deal of success in their educational role in that it creates a model to be emulated
- the author is well-established at the centre of Jesuit movement having served as a secretary to the founder of the movement, Loyola
- the date has value in placing this at a time when the Catholic Reformation was underway, the Jesuits having been founded in 1540 and the first Council of Trent having sat from 1545
- the tone is instructive, short clipped sentences spell out the imperative ingredients, the ‘musts’, needed to establish a Jesuit school.

Content and argument

- Araoz provides a guide, the implication is that this is easy to copy
- there is value in seeing what was regarded as a fully rounded Catholic education which included: grammar, humanities, classical languages as well as religious instruction. Spreading access to such an education might enhance the Church authority and lead to a revival of Catholicism
- despite Jesuit education attracting the sons and daughters of a good deal of Europe’s elite, there is value in seeing that the Church reached out more widely, education was not exclusive as it was to be offered free
- there is value in seeing the emphasis upon discipline which the Jesuit order was famous for, the students, ‘must be well behaved’, chastisement is a key feature.

Section B

- 02** To what extent was the Catholic Church weakened by Humanism in the years 1500 to 1517? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments/factors suggesting that the Catholic Church was weakened by Humanism in the years 1500 to 1517 might include:

- Humanism critiqued the dogmas of the medieval church. Humanists gathered information directly from the original sources (ad fontes). They took a view that the present form of Christianity was nothing like that which early Christians experienced, the Church did not welcome this new questioning approach
- Humanists suggested the Church was suffering from mission drift. Erasmus was shocked at how far the Church had strayed from the original teaching. In 'The Handbook of a Christian Gentleman' he satirised the manner in which scholasticism had supplanted the core teachings of Christ
- the Church's loss of direction was felt locally. Erasmus' 1509 satire 'In Praise of Folly' made fun of a typical churchman and so anti-clericalism grew. Many could identify with the depiction of a corrupt and worldly clergy; simony, pluralism and nepotism were widespread
- some Humanists, such as von Hutten, extended their criticism towards a foreign Pope. In particular, the behaviours of the Renaissance Popes, Alexander VI, Pius III, Julius II and Leo X; the growth of national feeling at this time suggests support for anti-Papalism
- the Church's own behaviours, prior to the 16th century, appeared to acknowledge the criticisms levelled at it. There was acceptance of the need for constant renewal through movements such as the 'Oratory of Divine Love'.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that the Catholic Church was weakened by Humanism in the years 1500 to 1517 might include:

- corruption and church abuses had existed for centuries. Whilst some people will certainly have heard about such practices, there is little evidence to support the idea that this was a universal or new problem that Humanism pointed up
- the idea that the Church should be the sole interpreter of the Bible and that the Pope had special status was widely accepted
- some apparent corrupt practices, pointed out by Humanists, were not that controversial. The sale of indulgences, were not only widely accepted but were popular as they provided comfort for those who had lost family members
- humanist criticism did not diminish popular piety. Most people, therefore, did not desire the Church to reform itself, for all its faults there was widespread acceptance of custom and practice
- the humanist argument that the Church was stuck in tradition and convention was invalid. There is evidence that the Church was not inflexible and welcomed debate and renewal, its holy orders showed it could evolve.

There is a balance to be struck here between an argument that demonstrates increasing anti-clericalism and one that suggests a continued emphasis on popular piety. In choosing one option it might naturally follow that the other line of thought has been overstated. It is possible that either argument might tend to focus upon different social brackets and nuance might be drawn from that. A sophisticated stance might be to suggest that it was possible to hold that there is truth in both arguments here. On balance, it is difficult to suggest that humanist criticism was any more relevant or accurate than previously. That said, what did seem to be making an impact was the view that Reformers and Humanists alike began to look at the sources and conclude that the Bible was the only source of authority.

03 'Zwingli's work in Zurich, in the years 1524 to 1531, did not result in a radical reformation.'

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/factors supporting the view that Zwingli's work in Zurich, in the years 1524 to 1531, did not result in a radical reformation might include:

- changes to religious practice within Zurich were not abrupt. Zwingli patiently set about winning the support of the Council and of rich and poor. He accepted that the Bible's interpretation was a matter for the elected Council to decide upon. Like Luther's, this was to a magisterial reformation
- Zwingli argued that violence should not be used against those who rejected his version of biblical teaching, preferring persuasion and reason. His association with violence, which might have been because he died in battle, is not justified
- the transformation of Zurich stimulated no great upheaval. The Council and the people were not alarmed at the changes to daily life that Zwingli presented
- Zwingli was open to the idea of debating the issues. The Catholic faction was invited to attend a deliberation on the religious future of the City however, they chose not to attend.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that Zwingli's work in Zurich, in the years 1524 to 1531, did not result in a radical reformation might include:

- Zwingli's association with iconoclasm led to a lack of restraint. Many subsequently feared the unleashing of the power of the mob which might result in anarchy and disorder. Zwingli and the south German/Strasbourg reformers were rather more radical than Luther and his supporters
- the early speed of change in Zurich appeared rapid. Zwingli quickly encouraged priests to marry and abandoned rules around fasting. Zwingli led by example in this, marrying in 1524. Monasteries were closed and their incomes put towards helping local charities with immediate effect
- Zwingli's ambition went well beyond Zurich. He wanted to ensure that the entire Swiss Confederation was 'saved'. This was in spite of the apparent reticence of other cantons, preachers were to be allowed out into the Confederation and if necessary they were to be backed by the military
- Zwingli was a warmonger. His lack of self-discipline caused the two wars of Kappel despite there being little appetite for this action in Zurich. Zwingli was killed in action during the second of these wars in 1531.

Zwingli showed a willingness to work with the authorities and in this he can clearly be identified as a magisterial reformer. Therefore, it can be argued he adopted a cautious approach. Zwingli sought change through planned stages, without public disruption and led by the political authorities. Given this conservatism it is likely that students will be able to offer a balance of evidence suggesting that Zwingli was reluctant to get out of alignment with law makers or indeed public opinion and that his reform of Zurich was marked by a disciplined approach. However, this was jeopardised through Zwingli's personal recklessness and a willingness to use military force to spread his reformation beyond Zurich, which led to his violent end. Nevertheless, it could be pointed out, by way of contrast, that there was far more radicalism to be found amongst the Swiss Anabaptists and the Swiss Brethren.

- 04** 'The growing strength of the Protestant movement, in the years 1529 to 1536, was due to the weaknesses of Charles V.'

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/factors suggesting that the growing strength of the Protestant movement, in the years 1529 to 1536, was due to the weaknesses of Charles V might include:

- Charles was seeking princely support for a successor. He wanted to secure Ferdinand, his brother, as his heir. Therefore, it was necessary for him to seek compromise and be pragmatic. An all-out attack on Protestant princes who might be persuaded to return to Catholicism was regarded as unnecessary
- Charles V was in a weak strategic position during these years. He was forced to suspend action against the Protestants in 1532 because of the Turkish threat to Vienna. The Truce of Nuremberg in 1532 conceded toleration to the Protestants pending a General Council of the Church; this encouraged the more reticent Protestant princes to declare conversion
- Charles could not find a solution to the Italian Wars. He could not alienate Francis I too much as he needed him versus the Ottoman Turks. Conversely, Francis I was eager to exploit divisions within the Holy Roman Empire
- Charles continued to lose ground in Germany. The Protestant triumph in Württemberg in 1534 was a massive blow. This was a large Dukedom, the meek manner in which Charles V accepted the restored Lutheran Duke, Ulrich, emboldened princely independence as it demonstrated his weak situation.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that the growing strength of the Protestant movement, in the years 1529 to 1536, was due to the weaknesses of Charles V might include:

- the Reform movement began to take on a form due to the continued efforts of Luther and Zwingli, in particular. Some German princes reacted to the Diet of Speyer in 1529 and its implementation of the Diet of Worms by uniting under the banner of 'Protestantism'
- Protestant beliefs became more coherent. The Augsburg Confession of 1530 cemented the Protestant movement. It provided a tangible platform that many could rally around
- the Protestant movement militarised. The Schmalkalden league of 1531 was a defensive alliance providing a military force. The League became a European political body; it was immediately joined by eight princes and eleven cities, membership involved a renunciation of affiliation with all imperial institutions
- the Papacy was unable or unwilling to call a General Council of the Church. This allowed Protestantism to continue to evolve, the views of Luther were compelling to many princes.

On the surface, Charles had an opportunity to resolve the Protestant issue due to the fact that he was actually present within the empire for most of this period. However, unresolved background issues constantly plagued him and regularly threatened to flare up again. Therefore, although Charles desired to enforce the Diet of Worms he was unable to do so. His position was so precarious that Catholic princes advised him against starting a war with the Protestants. The Protestants were able to take advantage of this position and so began to organise and cohere to a far greater degree with more princes and cities emboldened to break with from the Holy Roman Empire. Therefore, it can be argued that there is inter-dependence between the two sides of this argument.