



---

# A-LEVEL HISTORY

7042/2C: The Reformation in Europe 1500-1564  
Report on the Examination

---

7042  
June 2019

---

Version: 1.0

---

---

Further copies of this Report are available from [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2019 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

## **Section A**

### **Source A**

Too many responses here lacked nuance and were too concerned to focus on the ill treatment aspect of the source and so conclude that this was typical of a corrupted church. A more considered approach would have drawn attention to the view that the Inquisition was actually not as bloodthirsty as is often portrayed and was far more concerned with spiritual reform, those identifying this were well rewarded. Some students mixed up Spanish and Roman inquisition and so revealed a chronological inaccuracy. There were some simplistic ideas that the source could not tell us very much about the Catholic Reformation as it had not begun and so conflated this development simply with the Council of Trent.

### **Source B**

There was some sound knowledge displayed regarding the credentials of Pope Paul III as a reformer. Key clues within the content were sometimes missed, for instance the reference to abuses within the source as having 'long afflicted' the Church. Few were able to make the distinction between the reform of 'diseases' identified here and the lack reference to theology, when they did then this was well rewarded in the marking. There were also some naive inferences drawn from the reference to the delayed publication as evidence of a cover up and therefore further proof of corruption.

### **Source C**

The main problem here was that some students saw this as a description of a seminary rather than a blueprint for Jesuit education in schools. Therefore, the analysis was misdirected and erroneously saw this source as addressing one of the main criticisms of the church at this time, that of the poor standard of the priesthood. This missed the point about the use of a Jesuit education, particularly of Europe's political elite, as a means to counteract the growth of Protestantism. Some good answers looked at the attraction of the curriculum which led many to desire such an education even if they were not from a Catholic background. Responses to this source often focused on generalist points about the value of a private letter showing honesty. The utility of this approach, particularly with this source, reads like something pre-packaged and if used then the student has to actually take something from the source as illustration of the point.

Generally, the use of random omission as a limitation is problematic. This can be summarised as - because the source does not say something about any loosely connected topic then means it has to be handled with suspicion.

The attention to value is improving with provenance and tone not just identified but clearly linked to value. However, some students unhelpfully still lack some focus on historical accuracy or usefulness.

There is a problem for some students with their technique. There appears to be an overriding desire to show focus on the question by constantly repeating long phraseology from the wording of the question. In this instance the constant mantra that, 'this is valuable to an historian studying the Catholic Reformation' simply wastes the students time and they would be better advised to develop a short- hand and simple reference to value per se.

**Section B****02.**

There were some very good answers that closely adhered to the focus of the question namely, the impact of humanist thought at the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> Century. Most students were able to offer something on this. The less effective responses drifted into an examination of 'the condition of the church' more generally and rather than seeing this is a humanist question, regarded it as a 'corruption within the church' question. There may still have been some value in this as long as students were able to link this general corruption with what the humanists were saying. The best answers focused in on the intent of the humanists and identified balance from a view that the Church did not appear to be all that damaged in 1517.

**03**

This was the least popular question. There were a few good answers which paid close attention to the idea of radicalism rather than just difference with other reformers. Some students were able to explore the apparent conservatism of Zwingli's emphasis on magisterial reform. However, the majority of answers were not effective. Of these many tended to see the question as a comparator between Luther and Zwingli. Arising from this there were some simplistic assumptions which suggested that as the two men agreed with each other on much of their theology, that demonstrated Zwingli was not that radical.

**04**

This was the most popular question and it was almost universally well handled. There was a good deal of relevant material included in most responses and the majority were able to build in a genuine element of balance. Nuance was provided by views suggesting that Charles was a victim of circumstance and that nobody would have been able to fully command all the issues he was faced with or that the job required of the Holy Roman Emperor was just too great for one person. Most answers had a positive mix of detail, balance and analysis. Occasionally some answers drifted into events in the 1540s as further proof of Charles' impossible position and so there was some lack of chronological discipline in a few essays.

### **Mark Ranges and Award of Grades**

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results Statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.