

# **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 2011**

---

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, 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 2011

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622  
Facsimile: 01223 552610  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

**Question (a) Maximum mark 30**

	<b>A01a and b</b>	<b>AO2a</b>
<b>1</b>	13-14	15-16
<b>2</b>	11-12	13-14
<b>3</b>	9-10	10-12
<b>4</b>	7-8	8-9
<b>5</b>	5-6	6-7
<b>6</b>	3-4	3-5
<b>7</b>	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>
<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>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a
<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>
<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>A01a 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
<p>Total mark for the question = 70</p>	<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>
<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>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
<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>
<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>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
<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>
<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>

**The First Crusade and the Crusader States 1073–1130****1 The First Crusade****(a) Study Sources C and D**

**Compare these Sources as evidence for who went on the First Crusade. [30]**

Focus: Comparison of two Sources

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.

The Sources are **similar** in content in that both accounts are both from chronicles and make it clear that Urban's appeal was well received and large numbers flocked to the crusade. Both Sources agree that there was a strong response in France. The upper classes answered the call as they had the fighting ability as Source C suggests. Both Sources make it clear that the lower classes were also enthused. Both mention that the wealthy joined the crusade. Both refer to a mixture of social classes (higher rank and commoners), although Guibert in C is more specific in his ranking (nobility, knights, poor). Neither mentions townsmen.

The Sources **differ** in content in that Source C only takes examples from France, whereas the German historian in Source D refers to other nations. Source C puts more stress on the poor whereas Source D refers to those who left their fields, who were thus not destitute but may have been affected by the ‘famine’.

The **provenance** and **context** of the Sources should be used to evaluate these similarities and differences. Both the writers were giving their accounts a little while after the events so could have assembled a wider range of evidence. Ekkehad originally wrote one account and then altered it after he had been to the Holy Land and been given more information at first hand. But candidates may feel that his apparent willingness to give credence to stories about seeing heavenly signs and visions lessens his credibility in general. Guibert was writing in a small French monastery and relied on second hand accounts. He tended to believe that lay piety depended very much on what benefits they could expect. He is concerned to write a specifically ‘Frankish’ account (‘Deeds of God through the Franks’), whereas Ekkehad mentions ‘*other nations*’, as befits a German chronicler. Candidates may have specific knowledge of groups who went on crusade or refer to the People's Crusade but this should not divert from comparing the sources.

A supported judgement should be reached on their relative value as evidence. Some may prefer Ekkehad on the grounds he refers to areas other than the Franks and had visited the Holy Land meeting crusaders. Others may see the more specific information given by Guibert as more informative, as he too based his account on crusader recollection. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.

**(b) Study all the Sources.**

**Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that it was mainly economic factors which led people to go on the First Crusade. [70]**

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all five sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, and limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing on the terms of the question, but no set conclusion is expected.

The Sources contain references to different interpretations so they may be grouped according to their view. The **supporting** view, that economic motives were the main reason for people going on crusade is shown predominantly in Sources C, D and E although A deliberately targets the '*love of gold*' as part of the attraction of crusade. The **opposing** view, that other factors such as religious zeal were involved, is predominately found in Sources A and B, although C's reference to '*great news*' and '*desire*' could be interpreted as references to a strong religious motivation and D refers initially to 'forgiveness'.

The main **supporting** argument in Sources C, D and E is that there was much economic upheaval in the form of *poverty and famine* in Source C, *civil war, famine and sickness* in Source D and *severe drought, poor harvests and famine* in Source E. Source E adds the view that younger sons, who under primogeniture could not inherit lands, were keen to win fiefs for themselves. Candidates might be aware that this latter view has been challenged in that most of the crusading leaders in the First Crusade were far from being landless. The fact that all three Sources mention famine could be used to strengthen the view that economic factors were the prime motivating force. Alexius in A also, quite cynically, appeals to western greed – '*they should know that they will find more of it here than anywhere in the world*'.

The **provenance** of Sources C and D, written by contemporary observers, both of whom either had direct experience of the crusades or had spoken to those who had been on crusades, suggests they are reliable sources and they are also balanced in that they refer to religious motives ('*great news*' in C; '*promise of forgiveness*' in D). Ekkehad in D however may have a national slant – he implies the Franks went for reasons of famine etc., 'other nations' for more spiritual reasons (the Pope's summons; 'signs and prophets'). The historian in E is less balanced in the view presented, although may have referred to other reasons elsewhere.

The **opposing** argument is mainly in Sources A and B, but there are some references in C and D. Both Sources A and B are appeals, one from Alexius and the other from Pope Urban. Both stress the need to protect the Holy Places from '*the Turks*' in Source A and *from a race from the kingdom of the Persians* in Source B. Both emphasise the urgency of the task. The need to avenge the wrongs and the appeal to '*faithful Christians*' or those '*to whom God has given strength*' is explained. Source A has other quasi religious motives in the desire to protect sacred relics and Source D mentions '*forgiveness*', '*prophets*' and '*visions*' which encouraged some to join the crusade. Source C refers to the enthusiasm which met Urban's speech which implies that the religious appeal he was making was a major motivator. Source A does also, perhaps in desperation, suggest that if the religious motive is not enough, then the wealth of Constantinople could be a stronger draw but it is secondary to the main thrust of his appeal.

The **provenance** of Sources A and B, written by people who are trying to get a reaction from those who receive their message, indicates that they may be reliable in showing the primacy of religious motive, but the purpose for which they were designed could lead to some exaggeration of the threat. The tone of the language is quite extravagant. Contextual knowledge can back up the attacks on the Holy Places and the reaction to Urban's speech at Clermont. Some may consider the post crusade chroniclers in C and D as more reliable given their balance of religious and economic factors. Interestingly their first reference is to the spiritual, as is that of Alexius and the Pope in A and B. In C the poor are prepared to sell their '*assets at a low price*', suggesting the spiritual. However it is possible to stress that the inferences in A, C, D and E all suggesting that the underlying motive was economic. The conclusion may well be that different participants had different motives or that for many motives were mixed.

Supported overall judgement should be reached on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the question. No specific judgement is expected.

**2 The German Reformation 1517-1555****The Attack on the Church 1517-20****(a) Study Sources A and B****Compare these Sources as evidence for views on indulgences. [30]**Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

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.

The **provenance** and context of the Sources should be integrated into the comparison. **Source A** is a private letter written by Luther to Archbishop Albert of Mainz, who has allowed the sale of indulgences in his lands by the Dominican John Tetzel, on whose behalf Koch has written **Source B** as a public refutation of Luther's claims. The **date** of **Source A** is the eve of All Saints' Day 1517, when Luther publicly issued the 95 Theses in Wittenberg but hoped that this would remain an issue for academic debate, whereas **Source B** is issued two months later, when the printing presses have circulated copies of the 95 Theses and the issue of indulgences has become a public controversy.

In **content**, the Sources have fewer **similarities** than differences because they represent the opposing sides of the controversy and therefore are very useful together. In **Source A** Luther states that the simple folk believe that 'a letter of indulgence forgives all sins', and **Source B** argues that people may be 'released from sin through indulgences' and 'have all penalties taken away', linking to 'purgatory' in **Source A**. Each author claims that the other is in error. In **Source A**, Luther states that this is a 'false meaning' while, in **Source B**, Koch, an 'official church spokesman' on behalf of Tetzel, repeats three times the view that Luther is 'in error'.

However, whereas **Source B** states that through indulgences you 'gain peace', in **Source A** Luther claims that indulgences lead people 'to damnation'. While Tetzel in **Source B** states that the 'pope or even the least of priests have power over guilt', Luther in **Source A** claims that Albert of Mainz is 'leading people to damnation' and 'will be held responsible'. While **Source B** claims the Pope has power to remit sin 'by his own authority and that of church law', Luther in **Source A** argues that 'the only route to heaven is to earn salvation by the grace of God'. **B** mentions regret and confession as sufficient, unlike **A**. **Source B** does not mention money changing hands and stresses the spiritual benefits of indulgences, whereas **Source A** talks of the money jingling in the box and the rebuilding of St. Peter's in Rome. **Knowledge** of corrupt Renaissance popes and abuses like nepotism and simony might be used.

Luther's letter has a **tone** of outrage or threat, and Tetzel's response is angry. The background of **authorship** is similar - Luther and Koch are both University academics and Doctors, but **Source B** is a firm defence of the Catholic Church on behalf of Tetzel, himself a Dominican friar but not an academic, and evaluation of the **tone** might use **knowledge** of his 'hard sell' methods and outrageous claims as an indulgence seller. **Knowledge** of Albert's attempt to pay off high debts after the purchase of the archbishoprics of Magdeburg and Mainz, might inform comments on the audience of **Source A**, developing the corruption of the Church. A supported judgement, based on content, provenance and context, 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.

**(b) Study all the Sources.**

**Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that church corruption was the main issue in the attack on the church between 1517 and 1520.**

[70]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

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.

The Sources refer to both sides of the argument, so they may be grouped according to their view. **Sources C, D and E** suggest the **supporting** view, that a *corrupt* papacy, Curia and church hierarchy are the main issue in the broader attack on the church between 1517 and 1520. **Sources A, C, D and E** argue that the cause is Rome's economic exploitation of Germany, with national feeling and political power as underlying themes. **Sources A and B** give an **alternative** view that *forgiveness of sins* was the main issue for Luther at the start. However **Sources B, C and E** also suggest that fairly soon (from 1518) the issue of *papal authority* figured large for both sides.

The **supporting** view is that the power of a corrupt papacy and church hierarchy is the **main** issue. This is a logical development of Luther's challenge to the papal claim to power over remission of sins in **Source A** and to papal use of indulgences to rebuild St. Peter's. **Sources C and D** condemn the moral and economic corruption of Rome and the Curia. **Provenance** should be taken into account. Luther's **tone** in **Source C** is emotive and angry, as he is responding to an insulting public attack by Prierias, so he uses extreme language such as 'despising', 'ghastly', 'outrageous', 'abominations', inflaming the controversy and making it a personal attack on individuals. Von Hutten's **tone** in **Source D** is equally inflammatory - he claims 'mule-drivers, prostitutes and the most degraded followers', 'bold robbers and cunning hypocrites' are in charge of the Church in Rome, living in 'idle luxury'. Von Hutten was typical of disgruntled and impoverished imperial knights, so **provenance** may be judged overly subjective.

**Another** aspect of corruption is Rome's economic exploitation of Germany. The underlying theme in **Source A** is one of economic exploitation and corruption: rebuilding of St. Peter's, money jingling in the box. **Source D** regrets 'gold and silver' being 'squeezed out' by Rome and squandered. In **Source C** Luther appeals to national feeling when he says that 'the Emperor Maximilian and the Germans will not tolerate this'. Luther's appeal to the German nobility in **Source E** suggests forbidding annates going to Rome and takes a similarly nationalist approach, suggesting popes should exercise no authority over emperors. **Context** and **purpose** might be used in evaluation: Luther threatened with excommunication and summons to Rome, and hoped for princely support the year before the Diet of Worms.

An **alternative** theological view is in **Sources A and B** with a hint of the view in **Source D**. *Forgiveness of sins* is the main issue discussed in both Sources. Luther in **Source A** claims that the papacy and priesthood are misleading the simple folk and endangering their souls, leading them to damnation by the sale of indulgences. **Source B** claims that the sale of indulgences is accompanied by regret and confession, so is valid for salvation. Use of the provenance of the Sources is significant in evaluation of their views - the omission of any reference to money in **Source B** makes it less reliable and useful while Luther's private letter is written at a **time** before the public controversy ensues so is

more representative of his spontaneous view, while Koch, is writing a contrived defence of Tetzl and the church hierarchy.

Another issue is suggested in **B, C and E**, that of *papal authority*. Koch in **Source B** stresses the Popes acting in accordance with their own authority and Church Law on spiritual issues like guilt. Luther refutes the idea that the Church *is* the Pope in **Sources C and E**, mentioning other sources of authority – a General Council and, in a different context, the Emperor. He argues that Papal Rome should have less authority over national churches – bishops, church taxes and priests. This was clearly a public debate by 1520 (Luther's pamphlet in **Source E**). Although **Sources B and E** are public sources they reflect the development of the debate after 1517 about the church and reflect a move from indulgences, forgiveness and corruption to the issue of papal authority. Candidates may use the dating and the issue of 'publicity' to argue for a change in the main issue between 1517 and 1520.

Supported overall **judgement** should be reached on how far the Sources accept the interpretation that church corruption was the main issue in the attack on the Church. No specific judgement is expected.

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**14 – 19 Qualifications (General)**

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 2011