



HISTORY

9769/54

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

May/June 2016

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Published

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2016 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	54

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.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	54

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.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	54

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.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	54

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.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	54

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.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	54

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.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	54

Section A

1 (a) How far does Document A corroborate the humanist aims expressed in Document C? [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. Where appropriate, the answer should demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation and awareness of provenance by use not only of the text but of headings and attributions.

Similarities – They agree in the pre-eminence of holy scripture.
They agree that linguistic studies of Greek and Latin have advanced understanding.

Differences – A is concerned with establishing a correct version of the sacred text, while C is more preoccupied with the impact of knowledge of the Bible.
C has some faith in the future and thinks the glories of the primitive Church can be restored, while A has no confidence in the theologians currently in favour.
The optimism in C is not matched in A.

Provenance – Erasmus had just published *Praise of Folly*, which had been criticised by Dorp, professor of theology at Louvain. He was defending his revisions of the Vulgate, so was concentrating on the need for an accurate text and the ways in which traditional theologians obstructed this aim.

Lefèvre d'Étaples, in fact, shared Erasmus' concerns and at the University of Paris pursued similar goals. He wanted to spread his knowledge widely to help even the uneducated understand the scriptures.

Thus the two documents have similar aims but different emphases.

(b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that reform of the Papacy was the best way to reform the Church? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E). [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and make effective use of each although, depending on the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently and with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong both in range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate, an understanding and evaluation of different historical interpretations is to be expected.

The documents offer alternative views, with A hinting that the Popes are not using their authority to the right end and B showing a desire to throw off papal control, while E argues the Popes are partly to blame for the situation. The alternative view, that there were other issues, comes in A where the need for accurate texts is emphasised, in C where the need to be more like the primitive Church is the focus and in D where all Church leaders are blamed.

In A, Erasmus thinks the Popes are not doing their job and not working towards a more accurate edition of the Vulgate. In B, Valdes explains how Luther's attack on the Papacy

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	54

chimed in with national feeling in Germany. But he says the Germans also wanted a Council to reform the Church, which was another cause of discontent. But, since the Popes had to summon Councils, this could be a further implied criticism of the Papacy. In D, Pole categorically blames Church leaders for the growth of heresy and the failure to reform abuses. In E, the failure of the Popes and the Church to carry out reforms, despite being generally well intentioned, is stressed.

But other factors appear as well. In A, Erasmus argues forcefully that there is no will among most theologians to work to establish accurate texts. They think that the ratification of a text by a Council means it must be accurate, while Erasmus condemns their methods and their ignorance and sees them as a major obstacle to reform. C implies that the Church has moved away from being centred on the Gospel, although A might be seen as indicating a return to that focus. C thinks that a better knowledge of Greek will help here and the example of the Early Church may then be followed, although his reference to its many martyrs might not be seen as encouraging. In D, Pole, writing just before one of the sessions of the Council of Trent, is urging the Church to take some responsibility for past mistakes, such as being slow to root out Lutheranism. This theme is taken up in E.

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	54

Section B

2 What best explains the outcome of the Italian Wars in the years to 1559? [30]

AO1 – The question concerns the reasons why the wars ended in 1559 and why Spain and France gained and lost as they did.

AO2 – The immediate causes for the end of the war are the exhaustion of both parties – Spain was bankrupt and France nearly so. The original protagonists had died and Philip II and Henry II were less keen to fight on. The original cause of the war – domination of Italy – had been settled really by 1530 in favour of Spain and for certain after the 1538 Truce of Nice. In 1540, Charles invested his son Philip with the Duchy of Milan.

The Habsburgs, despite some setbacks, had greater resources. Francis I was obsessed with pursuit of glory and fear of Habsburg encirclement and so kept on fighting when he had little chance of winning and even allied with the Turks.

Henry II made gains with his alliance with the German Princes and took Metz, Toul and Verdun and Charles V failed in the siege of Metz and lost prestige and much money, so there was some gain for France. The French did get their claim to Burgundy acknowledged.

The 1559 peace became possible since the Habsburg lands were now split between Philip and Ferdinand, and the death of Mary Tudor ended Anglo-Spanish alliance, so France felt safer.

It could be argued that it all came down to money.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	54

- 3 Was the nature of its constitution the principal reason why the Holy Roman Empire was difficult to govern in this period? [30]**

AO1 – The question concerns explanations about why the HRE was so hard to rule, such as its constitution, the rival powers of princes and towns and the particular problems faced by Charles V there.

AO2 – The constitution was a factor. The only uniting institution was the Imperial Diet. The Emperor had ultimate legal powers and the gift of titles but no money-raising powers or permanent army, so was very limited as to what he could do.

This was made worse by the increasing power of the princes – most had legal control in their states and some began to rule like petty monarchs with courts which attracted lesser nobles to them. The Emperor could not interfere in their territories. Maximilian had formed ten Imperial leagues to try to reduce princely power but, in fact, this had increased it. The Swabian League kept order in southern Germany. The Imperial free cities and knights were supposed to be loyal to the Emperor but were becoming independent. Charles had specific problems – he spent a vast sum on getting elected so was in debt from the start. He was absent for long periods, e.g. in Spain, 1522–29. He had to face the Lutheran revolt and later French invasion.

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	54

4 Assess the view that Zwingli made little contribution to the development of the Reformation. [30]

AO1 – The question concerns the extent of Zwingli’s contribution. How wide was his influence and did his theological contributions promote the ideas of the Reformation or merely divide and weaken it?

AO2 – Zwingli’s contribution could be seen in theological terms and his disagreement with Luther did divide the Reformers and weakened protestant unity. His contribution was more significant in Switzerland and South West Germany, and he did not have the wider appeal of the other major figures of the Reformation either in terms of doctrine or in terms of organisation. He did take a leading role in opposing Anabaptism in Zurich and he achieved heroic status by taking up arms and being killed in battle at Kappel in 1532. His influence was felt indirectly as his successor, Bullinger, was consulted by other reformers, notably from England.

Zwingli claimed his ideas developed independently of Luther although at much the same time. He also cited the authority of scripture and carried through a reformation in Zurich in 1524. Zwingli put less emphasis on justification by faith alone. His major disagreement with Luther was over the Eucharist and the two met in 1529 at the Colloquy of Marburg to consider their differences. Their inability to agree could be said to have weakened Protestantism. He was influential in bringing the reformation to Berne, the most important Swiss canton, and this ensured the survival of the Swiss Reformation. He was instrumental in opposing the first Anabaptists who emerged in Zurich in 1526. His successor in Zurich, Henry Bullinger, was much consulted by other reformers, notably from England.

Alternatively, Calvinism largely dominated Protestantism in Switzerland and Lutheranism in Germany. Only southwest Germany, where the cities had much in common with Swiss cities, followed Zwingli. His determination to fight against Catholics in the Swiss Confederation led to his own death at Kappel in 1532, so his personal impact was short-lived.