



AS History

7041/2C – The Reformation in Europe c1500-1564

Component 2C The origins of the Reformation, c1500-1531

Mark scheme

June 2018

Version/Stage: 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

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.

The Reformation in Europe, c1500–1564**Component 2C The origins of the Reformation, c1500–1531****Section A**

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining attitudes to indulgences in 1517? **[25 marks]**
Target: AO2

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will provide a range of relevant well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or some comment on both, but lacking depth and have little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6-10**
- L1:** The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **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.

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.

In responding to this question, students may choose to address each source in turn or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

Source A: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:

Provenance and tone

- the value of this source is in showing the controversial way in which Tetzel sought to raise money for the Catholic Church, in particular the re-building of St Peter's Basilica in Rome which the Pope, Leo X, had committed to in 1506
- Tetzel, a Dominican friar, was in effect a salesman employed by Albrecht of Mainz, who himself owed money to the Papacy. The visitation of Tetzel within an area close to Wittenberg University, where Luther worked, is the reason why the 95 Theses appeared at this time. Consequently, indulgence selling became a scandal in Germany which in turn evolved into the Reformation
- the tone is similar to that of a modern day salesperson. Tetzel is shamelessly playing upon the guilt of the living who are perceived as having the ability to save the souls of their loved ones through gifts or payments.

Content and argument

- the source valuably demonstrates why the Church was increasingly a target for criticism. Tetzel is peddling a line designed to stimulate shame and guilt, he exploits the view that the living are indebted to their dead relatives. For example, the belief that souls were held in purgatory allowed Tetzel to abuse the sacrament of penance and manipulate the idea that forgiveness could be bought
- Tetzel's approach had some attractions. Regardless of the controversy that followed, the simple act of putting 'money into the box' provided the living with reassurance and a sense that the living could help the dead. Therefore the source valuably demonstrates why many Catholics would have accepted this practice and it should not be assumed that this was widely condemned
- Tetzel is playing upon the sense of responsibility and/or guilt that Catholic doctrine instilled but which Luther felt was being mismanaged. In this case the living are obliged to the dead because the latter have 'created', 'fed', 'cared for' and left possessions to them. They require something in return by speeding up the process of releasing souls from their suffering in purgatory so that they can take their eternal place in heaven.

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

Provenance and tone

- the value of this source is that many regard the publication of the 95 Theses as the starting point of the Reformation. The document is written by Martin Luther, an Augustinian monk, who worked at the University of Wittenburg in the German state of Saxony. We see where the controversy that will split the Church stems from
- at the core of the 95 Theses were two key beliefs, the bible was the central authority of all religious belief and salvation depended upon faith not deeds. Therefore, the action of purchasing indulgences is not scriptural and is exploitative. The publication of the Theses directly resulted from the proximity and mission of the papal indulgence seller
- the tone is assertive, unequivocal, uncompromising even legalistic in manner, this is all indicative that Luther was certain he had unlocked fundamental truths. The value here is that Luther is stating openly that some of these practices have no place in church teaching as they do not derive from Scripture and that this was heretical.

Content and argument

- the value here is that we see a sample of the range of arguments Luther applied to the indulgences issue which then acted as a spark for illuminating some of the wider criticisms of the Catholic Church. However, these ideas were not new and so Luther catches a moment in history which will lead to the Catholic Church becoming irrevocably divided
- Luther is not just attacking the practice of indulgences, but is concerned with the wider issues of misleading doctrine and the exploitative purpose of Tetzel who is raising money for the building of St Peter's, Germany seemed to be a particular target for this and so, whilst by his own admission Luther was saying nothing original, he is a spokesperson for wider concerns
- Luther suggests that Pope Leo X might also take a dim view of Tetzel and reject the sharp practice being undertaken in the name of the Papacy. There is value in the suggestion that at this stage Luther was not intent on a split with the Roman Church, he wanted reform and was particularly exercised by the indulgences debate.

Whilst Source A provides evidence as to why Luther was scandalised by the indulgences issue, it has limited value in expressing some of the wider doctrinal matters. The corruption of Tetzel's salesmanship does provide evidence of a church seeking to exploit superstition and ignorance. Source A shows us the sales technique employed and yet people still literally bought into what indulgences appeared to offer them. Therefore, it must be remembered that despite Tetzel's showmanship, these purchases were not unpopular. Source B provides more fully rounded evidence as to why the existence of such belief was misleading Christians on the grounds that this was not scriptural. Source B touches on some broader issues that provide further context for explaining why Luther was so occupied with this matter, for example, the spending of money on grand projects. Thus, Source B provides us with greater clarity as to why this particular issue provided such a battleground from 1517.

Section B

02 'By 1517, Humanism had severely weakened the Catholic Church.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 suggesting that by 1517, Humanism had severely weakened the Catholic Church might include:

- as the Renaissance spread, so the ideas of humanism travelled with it, showing the widespread nature of this scholarly thinking. The humanists wanted evidence rather than unquestioning acceptance of Catholic doctrine
- humanists, particularly Erasmus, had stoked up wider discontent with criticism of Church abuses, his chosen form was parody such as 'In Praise of Folly' 1509; this undermined Church authority thus creating a climate of anti-clericalism
- the humanists made specific attacks on clerical corruption, papal shortcomings and clerical ignorance, whilst promoting educational reform.

Arguments challenging the view that by 1517, Humanism had severely weakened the Catholic Church might include:

- Humanists sought reform, not the destruction of the Church. Erasmus remained a devoted Catholic until the end of his life, therefore the objective to make people better Christians
- some clerics welcomed Humanist thinking, through questioning one might be able to come to a clearer understanding of God; Pope Leo X praised Erasmus for his studies on the New Testament
- church attendance, selling of indulgences and other common practices remained strong in the years c1500 to 1517, showing the continued influence and power of the Catholic Church. Humanist views were academic and based on classical study; they were not looking to appeal to the uneducated.

Students might conclude that, although Humanism may have been instrumental in the Lutheran Reformation, it was predominantly an academic and theological movement, which did not seek to unsettle papal or clerical authority. Furthermore, its appeal was limited to the educated and not the wider public, who were mostly illiterate, and who were largely unaffected by their influence.

03 'Zwingli's reformation in Switzerland built on the work of Luther's in Wittenberg.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 suggesting that Zwingli's reformation in Switzerland built on the work of Luther's in Wittenberg might include:

- it is highly unlikely that events in Zurich would not have gained impetus from what had occurred in Germany. Zwingli would have followed proceedings there closely and could hardly have failed to be influenced. Therefore, doctrinally there was a good deal of congruence. Both rejected papal authority, priestly celibacy, purgatory, the veneration of saints
- politically, both embraced the idea of the Territorial Church, in which the religious views, embraced by the magistrates of a given region, were to be enforced upon the citizens of that region (making both 'Magisterial Reformers')
- regarding practicalities, both believed in the priesthood of all believers, both congregations (Lutheran and Zwinglian) partook of bread and wine at Communion. In fact, at Marburg there was agreement on fourteen out of fifteen points articles of faith, with only the debate on the Eucharist the major dividing line.

Arguments challenging the view that Zwingli's reformation in Switzerland built on the work of Luther's in Wittenberg might include:

- the Zwinglian reformation did not follow the example of the state based approach of the Lutheran one. Swiss towns and cities (Basel, Mulhouse, Bern) following the example of Zurich led the reform not the cantons. There were even cases where an individual church reformed. Therefore there was not the same emphasis on capturing the support of a mighty prince and so the model is less 'top down' than the Lutheran one
- whilst Luther reduced the number of sacraments he regarded as scriptural, he did not discard penance – Zwingli regarded this sacrament as a source of priestly power and therefore a cause of the corruption in the Church. The major point of doctrinal difference was the position the two adopted on the Eucharist and this became evident at Marburg in 1529 and showed Zwingli's independence from Luther
- Zwingli was more militant than Luther, he was far less respectful of the Church's past, and its traditions (iconoclasm). His is an immediately more radical break with Rome. Zwingli had little interest in developing a united front against the Catholic Church.

In Zwingli's early days as a reformer it was assumed he had been converted by Luther's beliefs and was in effect a disciple, they were almost exact contemporaries. Whilst Zwingli acknowledged their similarities he argued that these were coincidence. Zwingli always made the claim that his reform was independent of Luther and that in fact he had been teaching the need for reform long before he had even heard Luther's name. Nevertheless, although clearly Zwingli was his own man, when developing his reforming zeal it is hard to think that events in Zurich would have remained unaffected by the news which emerged from Wittenberg in 1517.