

AS

# History

Paper 2C The Reformation in Europe, c1500–1531  
Additional Specimen Mark scheme

---

---

Version/Stage: Stage 0.1

---

---

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](http://aqa.org.uk)

**AS History Paper 2 Specimen Mark Scheme****2C The Reformation in Europe, c1500–1531****Section A**

- |          |          |   |                   |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|
| <b>0</b> | <b>1</b> | With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining the influence of Erasmus on the early years of the Reformation? | <b>[25 marks]</b> |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|

*Target: AO2*

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

**Generic Mark Scheme**

- |            |   |              |
|------------|---|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | 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.  | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | Answers will provide a range of relevant of 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 judgments will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | 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. Judgments will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context.  | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | The answer will be partial. There may be <b>either</b> some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question <b>or</b> 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. | <b>6-10</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | The answer will <b>either</b> describe source content <b>or</b> 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.                                      | <b>1-5</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit.   | <b>0</b>     |

## 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

- Matter-of-fact, almost apologetic tone, attempting to excuse a previous position.
- Moderate language, clearly attempting to steer a middle ground.
- However, Erasmus has been shocked by the reaction to the papal bull and more superficially by the popular association with Luther.
- This is an exercise in damage limitation from Erasmus and an attempt to ensure that the papacy acknowledges the position of Erasmus.

### Content and argument

- Erasmus' position is slightly disingenuous. It is clear that Luther was close to Erasmus and that Erasmus did indeed read his works.
- The source suggests that Erasmus was unpopular because he refused to embrace Lutheranism. In fact the unpopularity stemmed as much from his unwillingness to break from Rome, despite his obviously Lutheran ideas.
- It is difficult to suggest that the extensive writing of Erasmus was anything but critical of the church – whether this smacks of disorder as alluded to in the source is more a matter of perspective.
- The source gives the impression of marginal importance. This is far from the case.

**Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points, for example:**

- such knowledge might include the titles of Erasmus' works and particularly seminal tracts such as the New Testament in Greek, or In Praise of Folly
- Erasmus had plainly mocked the church in his writings. His work on the testament went further in actually criticising the sources used

- Erasmus did not however attack the tenets of the church. He even dedicated his testament to Leo X.

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

#### **Provenance and tone**

- As a letter one might expect a degree of personal honesty, but this is not a private letter.
- Luther has a clear reason for writing this – he is keen to rebuild relations with Erasmus and as such the tone is very flattering and conciliatory.
- The language is clearly designed to flatter, for example ‘my Erasmus, amiable man’. There is quite a degree of familiarity about the text.

#### **Content and argument**

- There is an inference that Luther relied heavily on the teachings of Erasmus.
- Luther credits Erasmus with wide influence and ranks his own works on indulgences as minor compared to Erasmus.
- Here the emphasis is plainly on the sense of Erasmus as a sizeable influence.

**Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points, for example:**

- the Pope’s description that ‘Erasmus laid the egg which Luther hatched’. The source seems to support this view
- Erasmus’ ideas did have influence on Luther, but not necessarily on the population as a whole
- Erasmus was seen as too aloof and too removed from worldly concerns to have the degree of influence alluded to here
- Luther developed the ideas of Erasmus but did not copy them.

In arriving at a judgement as to the relative value of each source, students may conclude that Source A has a more reliable feel despite the obvious issues with provenance and reliability. Source B is falsely flattering and gives an impression of Erasmus’ significance which simply is not borne out in the period.

**Section B**

**0 2** 'The most serious threat to the church in the years 1517 to 1521 was the Ninety-Five Theses.'

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 supporting the view that the most serious threat to the church in the years 1517 to 1521 was the Ninety-Five Theses might include:**

- the timing of the Theses was not accidental and was designed to get maximum publicity at the viewing of Frederick's relics in November
- the Theses were quickly circulated; Luther printed copies for his own bishop and also for the Archbishop of Mainz
- the combative and engaging tone of the Theses caught the public mood at precisely the right time and fed off popular concerns over indulgences in particular
- the Theses attacked the very people closely involved in the sale of indulgences – the Archbishop of Mainz and the Pope
- the Theses was rapidly translated and spread throughout Europe due to the coincidental development of printing
- the Theses was the spark to Mainz sending his file on Luther to the Pope.

**Arguments challenging the view that the most serious threat to the church in the years 1517 to 1521 was the Ninety-Five Theses might include:**

- Luther had no intention through the Theses of attacking the broader Church – this was a directed appeal against a particular abuse in the Church, and even then of only one region
- the Theses merely latched onto existing concerns – e.g. of undue influence from an Italian pope
- Luther wasn't really stating anything new – what was different was the media
- Luther's other writings presented a more complete and cogent attack on the church
- the Meeting at Augsburg, the Leipzig debate and clearly the Diet of Worms might be judged to be much more significant, although the Theses was certainly the motivating factor.

Students might conclude that the Theses and their significance was more in relation to a process they began rather than the arguments in the Theses themselves.

**0 3** 'The spread of the radical reformation by 1531 was due to effective leadership.'

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 supporting the view that the spread of the radical reformation by 1531 was due to effective leadership might include:**

- the apparent readiness of Thomas M nzer to court trouble by alienating both the Secular authorities and Martin Luther
- Munzer's ideas were important in fuelling the Peasants' War. His 'elect of 300' being a clear indicator of the effectiveness of his ideas and of his preaching
- Munzer's preaching was key to the uniting of peasants behind the radical message
- Hubmaier would prove as significant although this might be said to have only occurred in opposition to the role of another leader, Hut
- the survival of the Moravian Anabaptists might be attributed almost entirely to the leadership of Jacob Hutter
- Hoffman's flight from Strasbourg in 1530 was the spark for the creation of a mass movement that spread much further than he could have originally envisaged.

**Arguments challenging the view that the spread of the radical reformation by 1531 was due to effective leadership might include:**

- the tendency of some radical movements to develop a 'democratic' culture which eschewed the need for leadership. This was characteristic of early Anabaptism and as such suggests that the spread was due to other factors
- most of the early leaders proved only important on the small scale. Even Munzer was dealt with effectively in 1525
- the dominance of leaders such as Hans Denck and Hans Hut proves their very ineffectiveness. The problem remained the lack of one clear leading figure. In this sense, leadership was divisive and not effective
- the nature of the message of many radical groups, which was likely to alienate political authority, e.g. refusal to take oaths, social change. This was appealing at a time of social upheaval
- the printing presses set up by refugees from Zurich ensured that the spread of radical ideas needed no leader
- the lack of appeal to the established middle classes, who had proved so important in promoting reform in towns and cities and nobility, suggests that the Reformation's appeal was more than ideological
- the willingness to resort to violence in the Peasants' War possibly indicates a more radical edge
- the extent to which 'conventional' reformers such as Luther and Zwingli distanced themselves from radicalism further suggests that the spread had a radical appeal.

Students are likely to conclude that whilst the radical reformation had some strong leaders, leadership was only one of several reasons for its development.