
HISTORY (PRINCIPAL)

9769/05D

Paper 5D Special Subject: Reformation Europe, 1516–1559

For Examination from 2016

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

2 hours

MAXIMUM MARK: 60

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

This document consists of **9** printed pages and **1** blank page.

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.

- 1 (a) **How are the views expressed about the state of the Church in Document C corroborated by those in Document B?** [10]

Where appropriate, the answer should demonstrate an awareness of provenance by use of both the text and of headings and attributions.

Both documents refer to the failure of the authorities to ensure that those being ordained are worthy candidates. The 1537 report (Document C) makes it clear that the decrees of the Lateran Council have not been enforced. The documents also agree in general terms that there are abuses which need reforming, but they provide different examples, with Document B stressing the need for chastity and the end of simony, while Document C emphasises absenteeism and a lack of reverence in church services. This latter is the only mention of religious practice as opposed to discipline and behaviour. As official sources, both are reliable and candidates may be aware of the background of C and the reformers who were on the Council. There is clearly no profit for the Church to publicise its shortcomings so these documents are likely to show the reality of the situation.

- (b) **How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that Church reform was slow to come about because of the attitudes of Church leaders? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E).** [20]

Most of the documents suggest that the leaders of the Church were dragging their feet. In Document A the cardinals and the German bishops are shown to be guilty of abuses and paying only lip-service to the spiritual demands of their beliefs. Document B shows that former regulations had been ignored and Document C had direct advice for the Pope about the behaviour of bishops. Document E explains that bishops had particular entrenched attitudes to their roles which prevented reform. But there are other explanations given. In A the parish priests are also greedy, although they are only copying their so-called betters. This indicates that resistance to reform was widespread. B reinforces this view and C refers to absentee priests in addition to bishops. Document D alone blames secular, rather than Church, leaders for the delay. Of the originators of the documents, Erasmus as a leading humanist was keen to bring about reform from within the Church and so took a view which may be exaggerated, but which was probably borne out by his travels in Europe and personal experience. Paul III was trying to get the Council underway and expresses his frustration that Charles and Francis had other priorities. Documents B and C are official and D backs them up, so these can be viewed as reliable.

2 Assess the view that Charles V lacked real authority in his dealings with the Princes of the Empire. [30]

AO1/AO2 – Candidates could argue that Charles V did lack authority in that the multiplicity of authorities in the Empire and the need to conciliate the Diet limited his power. He needed the Diet to raise taxes to enable him to pay an army with which to confront the Princes, so it is not surprising that they refused. His many other commitments meant that he was often absent from Germany and the religious split was an additional complication. The Lutheran princes challenged him, even allying with Henry II in the 1550s. When he looked as if he might prevail, the Catholic Princes joined in to protect their rights and refused to accept reforms to taxation in the 1547 Diet. Even his brother challenged him when Charles tried to ensure Philip as Ferdinand's heir. The final Peace of Augsburg illustrates Charles' powerlessness. On the other hand, candidates could also argue that Charles succeeded in being elected as Emperor, if at great cost. In 1530 Ferdinand was recognised as King of the Romans. In 1544 Charles won over the Duke of Bavaria and Maurice of Saxony, while Philip of Hesse was disabled by his bigamy. The victory at Muhlberg was the result. But this situation did not last. Candidates could therefore argue that Charles did have authority but that he made errors of judgement which in the end diminished his authority.

3 How far was Francis I personally responsible for the Habsburg-Valois rivalry? [30]

AO1/AO2 – Candidates could argue that Francis was much to blame. He was determined to pursue military glory to show himself to be a major force in Europe. He invaded Milan in 1515 soon after becoming King of France. He broke the terms of the Treaty of Madrid. Even when he was defeated in Italy he renewed the war in northern France. In 1543 he even allied with the Turks to use their naval power against Charles. But there is an alternative view that Francis had some justification in fearing the empire of Charles V, even if Charles had neither the inclination nor the time to make himself the ruler of Europe. Possession of Milan, to which the French had some claim, would allow Charles to dominate northern Italy and control the Papacy, which seemed threatening to Francis, and the capture of Milan was one of his prime aims. There were personal rivalries too. But Charles was more favourable to a peace settlement than Francis was. Candidates may conclude that if any single person was responsible it was Francis I, but that he was provoked or, at least, he thought he was.

4 To what extent was the appeal of Luther's ideas primarily religious? [30]

AO1/AO2 – Candidates may argue that religious liberation as preached by Luther had a great deal of appeal. *Solifidianism sola scriptura* and the priesthood of all believers gave the laity a new importance and a new approach to religion. The 1520 pamphlets laid out his views clearly and won him support. Many of the cities, with their high literacy rate, were receptive to Luther's theology. Some Princes, or their wives, were genuine converts. Alternatively, candidates could argue that disadvantaged groups in Germany saw Lutheranism as providing hope for the future. The Knights' War and the Peasants' War showed these groups fighting for social freedom. Social tensions in the cities had an influence and the cities wanted to break away from ecclesiastical control. Princes could take over Church land and enrich themselves and they gained greater sovereign power once control by the Church was eliminated from their borders. Candidates are likely to take the cynical view that *cui bono* was the key to conversion to Lutheranism, but may point out that motivation may well have been mixed, as a whole series of circumstances led to the appeal of Luther. For many of his contemporaries, there was no clear demarcation between religious and other motives.

