

## **History A**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **F964/01**: European and World History Enquiries.  
Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1073-1555

## **Mark Scheme for June 2013**

---

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2013

**Annotations**

Annotation	Meaning

**Subject-specific Marking Instructions**

**Question (a) Maximum mark 30**

	AO1a and b	AO2a
1	13–14	15–16
2	11–12	13–14
3	9–10	10–12
4	7–8	8–9
5	5–6	6–7
6	3–4	3–5
7	0–2	0–2

**Notes related to Part A:**

- (i) Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO
- (ii) If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found
- (iii) Many answers will not be at the same level for each AO

## Marking Grid for Question (a)

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a
Total for each question = 30	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context;</li> <li>- the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied.</li> </ul>	As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.
<b>Level 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent and developed comparison of the key issue with a balanced and well-supported judgement. There will be little or no unevenness.</li> <li>• Focused use of a range of relevant historical concepts and context to address the key issue.</li> <li>• The answer is clearly structured and organised. Communicates coherently, accurately and effectively.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13–14</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focused comparative analysis. Controlled and discriminating evaluation of content and provenance, whether integrated or treated separately.</li> <li>• Evaluates using a range of relevant provenance points in relation to the sources and question. There is a thorough but not necessarily exhaustive exploration of these.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>15–16</b></p>
<b>Level 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Largely comparative evaluation of the key issue with a balanced and supported judgement. There may be a little unevenness in parts.</li> <li>• Focused use of some relevant historical context with a good conceptual understanding to address the key issue.</li> <li>• The answer is well structured and organised. Communicates clearly.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>11–12</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant comparative analysis of content and evaluation of provenance but there may be some unevenness in coverage or control.</li> <li>• Source evaluation is reasonably full and appropriate but lacks completeness on the issues raised by the sources in the light of the question.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13–14</b></p>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a
<b>Level 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some comparison linked to the key issue. Is aware of some similarity and/or difference. Judgements may be limited and/or inconsistent with the analysis made.</li> <li>• Some use of relevant historical concepts and contexts but uneven understanding. Inconsistent focus on the key issue.</li> <li>• The answer has some structure and organisation but there is also some description. Communication may be clear but may not be consistent.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>9–10</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a comparison but there is unevenness, confining the comparison to the second half of the answer or simply to a concluding paragraph. Either the focus is on content or provenance, rarely both.</li> <li>• Source evaluation is partial and it is likely that the provenance itself is not compared, may be undeveloped or merely commented on discretely.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>10–12</b></p>
<b>Level 4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some general comparison but undeveloped with some assertion, description and/or narrative. Judgement is unlikely, unconvincing or asserted.</li> <li>• A general sense of historical concepts and context but understanding is partial or limited, with some tangential and/or irrelevant evidence.</li> <li>• Structure may be rather disorganised with some unclear sections. Communication is satisfactory but with some inaccuracy of expression.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>7–8</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempts a comparison but most of the comment is sequential. Imparts content or provenance rather than using it.</li> <li>• Comparative comments are few or only partially developed, often asserted and/or 'stock' in approach.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>8–9</b></p>
<b>Level 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited comparison with few links to the key issue. Imparts generalised comment and /or a weak understanding of the key points. The answer lacks judgement or makes a basic assertion.</li> <li>• Basic, often inaccurate or irrelevant historical context and conceptual understanding.</li> <li>• Structure lacks organisation with weak or basic communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5–6</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifies some comparative points but is very sequential and perhaps implicit</li> <li>• Comment on the sources is basic, general, undeveloped or juxtaposed, often through poorly understood quotation.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>6–7</b></p>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a
<b>Level 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comparison is minimal and basic with very limited links to the key issue. Mainly paraphrase and description with very limited understanding. There is no judgement.</li> <li>• Irrelevant and inaccurate concepts and context.</li> <li>• Has little organisation or structure with very weak communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3–4</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little attempt to compare. Weak commentary on one or two undeveloped points, with basic paraphrase. Sequencing is characteristic.</li> <li>• Comments on individual sources are generalised and confused.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3–5</b></p>
<b>Level 7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fragmentary, descriptive, incomplete and with few or no links to the key issue. There is little or no understanding. Much irrelevance.</li> <li>• Weak or non-existent context with no conceptual understanding.</li> <li>• No structure with extremely weak communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0–2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No attempt to compare either content or provenance with fragmentary, brief or inaccurate comment.</li> <li>• Makes no attempt to use any aspects of the sources.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0–2</b></p>

**Question (b) Maximum mark 70**

	<b>AO1a and b</b>	<b>AO2a and b</b>
<b>1</b>	20–22	42–48
<b>2</b>	17–19	35–41
<b>3</b>	13–16	28–34
<b>4</b>	9–12	21–27
<b>5</b>	6–8	14–20
<b>6</b>	3–5	7–13
<b>7</b>	0–2	0–6

**Notes related to Part B:**

- (iv) Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO
- (v) If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found
- (vi) Many answers will not be at the same level for each AO

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
Total mark for the question = 70	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context;</li> <li>- the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied.</li> </ul>	<p>As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.</p> <p>Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.</p>
<b>Level 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convincing analysis and argument with developed explanation leading to careful, supported and persuasive judgement arising from a consideration of both content and provenance. There may be a little unevenness at the bottom of the level.</li> <li>• Sharply focused use and control of a range of reliable evidence to confirm, qualify, extend or question the sources.</li> <li>• Coherent organised structure. Accurate and effective communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>20–22</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A carefully grouped and comparative evaluation of <b>all</b> the sources with effective levels of discrimination sharply focused on the interpretation.</li> <li>• Analyses and evaluates the strengths, limitations and utility of the sources in relation to the interpretation. Uses and cross references points in individual or grouped sources to support or refute an interpretation.</li> <li>• Integrates sources with contextual knowledge in analysis and evaluation and is convincing in most respects. Has synthesis within the argument through most of the answer.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>42–48</b></p>



AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
<b>Level 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good attempt at focused analysis, argument and explanation leading to a supported judgement that is based on the use of most of the content and provenance.</li> <li>• A focused use of relevant evidence to put the sources into context.</li> <li>• Mostly coherent structure and organisation if uneven in parts. Good communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>17–19</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grouped analysis and use of <b>most</b> of the sources with good levels of discrimination and a reasonable focus on the interpretation.</li> <li>• Analyses and evaluates some of the strengths and limitations of the sources in relation to the interpretation. May focus more on individual sources within a grouping, so cross referencing may be less frequent.</li> <li>• Some, perhaps less balanced, integration of sources and contextual knowledge to analyse and evaluate the interpretation. Synthesis of the skills may be less developed. The analysis and evaluation is reasonably convincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>35–41</b></p>
<b>Level 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mainly sound analysis, argument and explanation, but there may be some description and unevenness. Judgement may be incomplete or inconsistent with the analysis of content and provenance.</li> <li>• Some relevant evidence but less effectively used and may not be extensive.</li> <li>• Reasonably coherent structure and organisation but uneven. Reasonable communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13–16</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some grouping although not sustained or developed. Sources are mainly approached discretely with limited cross reference. Their use is less developed and may, in parts, lose focus on the interpretation. There may be some description of content and provenance.</li> <li>• Is aware of some of the limitations of the sources, individually or as a group, but mostly uses them for reference and to illustrate an argument rather than analysing and evaluating them as evidence. There is little cross referencing.</li> <li>• There may be unevenness in using knowledge in relation to the sources. Synthesis may be patchy or bolted on. Analysis and evaluation are only partially convincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>28–34</b></p>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
<b>Level 4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempts some analysis, argument and explanation but underdeveloped and not always linked to the question. There will be more assertion, description and narrative. Judgements are less substantiated and much less convincing.</li> <li>• Some relevant evidence is deployed, but evidence will vary in accuracy, relevance and extent. It may be generalised or tangential.</li> <li>• Structure is less organised, communication less clear and some inaccuracies of expression.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>9–12</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sources are discussed discretely and largely sequentially, perhaps within very basic groups. Loses focus on the interpretation. The sources are frequently described.</li> <li>• May mention some limitations of individual sources but largely uses them for reference and illustration. Cross referencing is unlikely.</li> <li>• An imbalance and lack of integration between sources and knowledge often with discrete sections. There is little synthesis. Analysis and explanation may be muddled and unconvincing in part.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>21–27</b></p>
<b>Level 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little argument or explanation, inaccurate understanding of the issues and concepts. The answer lacks judgement.</li> <li>• Limited use of relevant evidence or context which is largely inaccurate or irrelevant.</li> <li>• Structure is disorganised, communication basic and the sense not always clear.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5–8</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited attempt to use the sources or discriminate between them. The approach is very sequential and referential, with much description. Points are undeveloped.</li> <li>• There is little attempt to analyse, explain or use the sources in relation to the question. Comment may be general.</li> <li>• There is a marked imbalance with no synthesis. Analysis and explanation are rare and comments are unconvincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>14–20</b></p>
<b>Level 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is very little explanation or understanding. Largely assertion, description and narrative with no judgement. Extremely limited relevance to the question.</li> <li>• Evidence is basic, generalised, patchy, inaccurate or irrelevant.</li> <li>• Little organisation or structure with poor communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3–4</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very weak and partial use of the sources for the question. No focus on interpretation.</li> <li>• A very weak, general and paraphrased use of source content.</li> <li>• No synthesis or balance. Comments are entirely unconvincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>7–13</b></p>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
<b>Level 7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No argument or explanation. Fragmentary and descriptive with no relevance to the question.</li> <li>• No understanding underpins what little use is made of evidence or context.</li> <li>• Disorganised and partial with weak communication and expression.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0–2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little application of the sources to the question with inaccuracies and irrelevant comment. Fragmentary and heavily descriptive.</li> <li>• No attempt to use any aspect of the sources appropriately.</li> <li>• No contextual knowledge, synthesis or balance. There is no attempt to convince.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0–6</b></p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(a)	<p>The Sources are <b>similar</b> in content in that both accounts indicate that there was a great deal of rejoicing. The Holy Sepulchre was the focus of celebration in both accounts and the pilgrims were very pleased to be able to visit the Holy Places again. In <b>Source B</b>, Raymond of Aguilers describes singing a new song, a clear biblical reference and in <b>Source C</b>, Fulcher of Chartres has a new hymn. Both mention prayers being offered and both suggest a degree of triumphalism, triumphant in <b>B</b> and exaltation in <b>C</b>.</p> <p>The Sources <b>differ</b> in content in that <b>Source B</b> says nothing at all about the slaughter of the inhabitants of Jerusalem or about the plunder, although there is mention of hardships and labour from the crusaders. <b>Source C</b> has detail on how the looting was systematically organised and some of the poorer crusaders clearly made huge gains. <b>Source B</b> has considerable implications, that the war was just, that the pagans were deservedly humiliated and that the descendants of the apostles, for whom Jerusalem was crucially important, had carried out their religious duty. <b>Source C</b> implies that the war was just but condones the plunder and enrichment of the crusaders.</p> <p>The <b>provenance</b> and <b>context</b> of the Sources should be used to evaluate these similarities and differences. Both the writers are writing soon after the events and both have a clear Christian perspective. <b>Fulcher</b> was not actually present at Jerusalem as he had gone to Edessa with Baldwin, but came later to make his pilgrimage. His account comes from what others told him, but such a vivid experience was likely to be accurately recalled. He would wish to show that the Franks were a disciplined army. Some of the poor who became rich may have been among his informants. <b>Raymond of Aguilers</b> was an eye-witness and had contributed a sermon when the crusaders processed up the Mount of Olives and were derided by the Saracens. His language, as noted, has biblical connotations and he sees the outcome as a just reward for both sides. Candidates may well conclude that the more balanced version of <b>Fulcher</b> is the more reliable.</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources</u> No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source ‘as evidence for.....’ The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>A supported judgement should be reached on their relative value as evidence. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>The Sources contain references to different interpretations so they may be grouped according to their view. The <b>supporting</b> view that the crusade was mainly about religion is found in <b>Source A</b>, Urban's sermon, <b>Source B</b>, Raymond of Aguilers, and in <b>Source C</b> in part. The alternative view that booty and pillage were uppermost in the minds of the crusaders is found in parts of <b>Source C</b>, in <b>Source E</b>, the account of Guibert and in <b>Source D</b>, the Arab version.</p> <p>The <b>supporting</b> argument in <b>Sources A and B</b> is that Jerusalem was of huge significance to Christians and needed to be liberated so that the pilgrims could again visit the Holy Places. The Pope explains in detail why Jerusalem mattered and Raymond exults that the quest has succeeded and pilgrimages can be resumed. Parts of <b>Source C</b> back up this viewpoint. However, the purpose of the Sermon in <b>Source A</b> is to encourage religious fervour and Raymond in <b>B</b> accompanied the crusade in a religious capacity. Both sources will see the crusade in religious terms. Fulcher in <b>C</b> however is more balanced.</p> <p>The <b>opposing</b> argument is in <b>Sources C, D and E</b>, but there are some implied references in <b>Source B</b>. In <b>Source C</b>, the lure of worldly gain plays a clear role and the disciplined approach to looting shows it was hardly a case of being carried away by the moment. In <b>Source E</b>, the lure of the East and its way of life has won over Baldwin and he lives like a local lord and there are hints of paganism. <b>Source D</b>, from another viewpoint entirely, describes the vast amount of slaughter and details the pillage. The rather distasteful (to modern eyes) glorying in victory in <b>Source B</b> could be held to show that pure religious motives could slip at times. Thus political ambition (<b>E</b>), loot (<b>C and D</b>) and glory in violence and slaughter (<b>C and D</b>) played a major role in the crusade. Candidates might however link the looting of the Dome of the Rock in <b>D</b> and the violence with religious fervour.</p> <p>Regarding the <b>provenance</b> and <b>context</b>, the Sources take the views that would be expected. The Pope is making an emotional appeal to the Franks in <b>Source A</b> and needs to get every last drop of pathos into his argument. Candidates are likely to know that he was successful and the initial fervour for the crusade was largely religious. <b>Source B</b> is written by an enthusiastic chaplain who saw the victory almost entirely in religious terms and as wholly justified. He would agree with the Pope that Jerusalem was the centre of the world and that the Moslem former rulers</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on a set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual evidence and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p> <p>Supported overall judgement should be reached on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the question. No specific judgement is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>were indeed people who knew nothing of God. <b>Source C</b> describes the slaughter dispassionately and, apparently, sees no contradiction between the killing on the one hand and giving thanks to God on the other. <b>Source E</b>, from a reliable witness, shows that noble birth mattered in the Crusader Kingdoms and that wealth and stylish living were seen as fair rewards. <b>Source D</b>, as a Moslem source, is bound to think differently. Candidates might question the accuracy of the detail as the source is written some time later, although the writer had spent time in Baghdad.</p> <p>Candidates may use other knowledge about atrocities and the gaining of material rewards by crusaders to argue that religion was not the main focus, or they may refer to the accounts in the chronicles of religious activities and events like the finding of the Holy Lance, which raised morale among the armies.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (a)	<p>The Sources <b>agree</b> that Luther was jovial, 'merry, even playful' in <b>C</b>, 'greeted us kindly and drank our health' in <b>B</b>. Both suggest that he was critical, <b>Source B</b> of pleasure-seeking princes and <b>Source C</b> of Pope and Emperor. The sources <b>differ</b> in their tone. <b>Source B</b> suggests that Luther had been reading a book and was relaxed while <b>Source C</b> stresses his abusive, contemptuous, scornful language and penetrating, sparkling eyes 'like those of obsessives'. <b>Source C</b> also describes his manner of speech as 'as intense as his writing', so the author must have read Luther's work. He seems disapproving whereas the student in <b>Source B</b> seems star-struck. The humanist seems to be impressed by the fact that Luther is translating Old Testament texts, perhaps because of his <b>audience</b>, his local bishop who is likely to be interested to hear this. <b>Source B</b> is likely to reach a wide audience, his work was published, albeit later in the career of both, as Luther's reputation had grown and altered by 1540.</p> <p>The <b>provenance</b> of the Sources should be integrated into the comparison. <b>Source B</b> is the recollection of a chance meeting with Luther published 18 years after the event, whereas <b>Source C</b> is a private letter written soon after a meeting with Luther planned out of curiosity. The author of <b>Source B</b> was an impressionable young student at the time, en route to Wittenberg to study, so is likely to have been supportive of religious reform, whereas the author of <b>Source C</b> is more mature, as a humanist diplomat making a detour to Wittenberg. The diplomat has a purpose - to find out what Luther is like because of his fame, whereas the student on <b>Source B</b> did not know the man in the inn was Luther, and asked if he was in Wittenberg. This makes <b>Source B</b> more dramatic, 'it was Luther', giving an intriguing story a punch line (in fact the author wrote it long after the event to impress his children, something candidates are not expected to know). The author of <b>Source C</b> had set off from Spain en route to Catholic Poland, so it is likely he had heard negative opinions of Luther, similarly in some ways to <b>Source B</b>, 'others reviled him'. However, the content of <b>Source B</b> states that in Switzerland, where the student may have begun his journey, some held positive opinions of Luther, 'some praised him'. In <b>Source C</b> the diplomat comments on Luther's 'wit, learning and eloquence', giving a hint of balance.</p> <p>The <b>context</b> of the two meetings is not far apart in date, but Luther's situation has changed considerably. <b>Source B</b> refers to him wearing 'a plain doublet and hose</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>and carrying a sword'. <b>Knowledge</b> might be used to explain that he was in disguise as 'Junker George', and returning to Wittenberg after hiding in the Wartburg since the Diet of Worms. The implication is that he was brave to be all alone, as he was under the imperial ban and his life was in danger, making his relaxed impression more significant. <b>Source C</b>, in 1523, sees Luther safely back at Wittenberg university, with 'a great desire for fame'. He is 'self-conscious' in greeting the diplomat, whose status would have been higher than that of the student.</p> <p>A supported judgement should be reached on their relative value as evidence, taking into consideration content, provenance and context. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>		
(b)	<p>The Sources contain references to both sides of the argument, so they may be grouped according to their view. <b>Source A</b> is very useful for the <b>positive</b> view that Luther was widely admired as the hero of religious reform, and may be cross-referenced with <b>Sources B</b> and <b>D</b> (which might be used both for and against the interpretation). <b>Sources C</b> and <b>E</b> have more <b>negative</b> than positive views.</p> <p>The <b>positive</b> argument is in <b>Sources A, B</b> and <b>D</b>. Albrecht Dürer's diary, a spontaneous record, <b>Source A</b>, reveals a personal admiration for Luther and fears for his safety. He praises Luther's 'true and holy spirit', the clarity of his writing and 'his suffering for the Christian faith'. This hero worship is in <b>context</b> of Luther's disappearance, after being outlawed at the Diet of Worms in 1521, and the uncertainty about his fate, 'if he lives or they have murdered him'. Therefore his enemies were far from admiring him as a religious hero. In Antwerp, Dürer would be unaware that Frederick the Wise had kidnapped Luther for his own protection, explaining the emotive tone of <b>Source A</b>. Luther's fame had obviously reached the Netherlands. <b>Source B</b> is written as a memoir by a student hoping to study at Wittenberg university, so he is likely to have been impressed by having met Luther in cognito, bravely returning from the Wartburg, alone and risking his life. However, in response to Luther's questioning, <b>Source B</b> records only the positive and negative views of the Swiss and does not give a clear impression that the student admired him as a religious hero at the time. This makes it less useful than <b>Source A</b> as evidence for 1521-24 and thus for the interpretation. <b>Source D</b> supports the</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p> <p>A supported overall <b>judgement</b> is required on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the light of the changing religious context. No specific judgement is expected.</p>



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>view effectively as an example of propaganda in favour of Luther, but also points out how his enemies condemned him, so it has a dual use. The form of ‘a letter from the angels’ was a common pamphlet style during the reformation. This example is a letter, supposedly from the Devil, condemning Luther for directing souls to Christ instead of him, using the Bible neglected for hundreds of years and discouraging people from sinning. <b>Source D</b> thus depicts Luther as the hero of religious reform for defying the corrupt and evil Catholic authorities, referred to as the Devil’s servants, and undermining their power and wealth. This group of sources may be seen to provide the more convincing argument.</p> <p>The sub-text of <b>Source D</b> is therefore the <b>counter-argument</b> – the hostility of the Catholic authorities who condemn Luther, similarly to some Swiss, in <b>Source B</b>. Similarly, <b>Sources C</b> and <b>E</b> might be used to support the argument against Luther, though both authors are humanists who might be expected to desire religious reform. The author of <b>Source C</b> has some status as a diplomat, but his reputation is no match for Erasmus, the internationally renowned inspiration for religious reform, reputed to have ‘laid the egg which Luther hatched’. The Polish diplomat in <b>Source C</b> had travelled from Catholic Spain to Poland, but made a detour out of curiosity to see Luther. He praises Luther’s ‘wit, learning and eloquence’, but his letter to his Catholic bishop, as expected considering its audience, criticises Luther for his scorn, abuse and contempt for the Catholic authorities, which might be linked to his ‘stubborn refusal to submit to them in the last line of <b>Source D</b>. <b>Source C</b> comments on Luther’s ‘intensity’, ‘obsessiveness’ and ‘desire for fame’, which hardly suggest a hero of religious reform despite acknowledgement of his work in translating the Old Testament. The author of <b>Source E</b>, Erasmus, is the author of the Greek New Testament which started Luther on the road to the 95 Theses, but his views on Luther have changed from moderate admiration to opposition by 1524. He is openly stating Luther’s many faults, such as ‘flying blindly at church errors’ in a letter to Melanchthon, Luther’s able and moderate supporter in Wittenberg. He fears that purification of religion might have been achieved without Luther’s ‘bitter medicine’ in destroying authority. The context of this letter is the Knights and Peasants’ War in Germany, while Erasmus lived in Switzerland at the heart of a network of moderate reform. This side of the argument is strongly supported and has a range of evidence from parts of Europe as well as Catholics and humanists, so might be seen as convincing, especially by 1524 when Luther was associated</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>with the outbreak of violence.</p> <p>Supported overall <b>judgement</b> should be reached on how far the Sources accept the interpretation that Luther was widely admired as the hero of religious reform between 1521 and 1524. No specific judgement is expected.</p>		

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
1 Hills Road  
Cambridge  
CB1 2EU

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)**

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations  
is a Company Limited by Guarantee  
Registered in England  
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)  
Head office  
Telephone: 01223 552552  
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2013

