

History A

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

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

Mark Scheme for January 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

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"> - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied. 	As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.
Level 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent and developed comparison of the key issue with a balanced and well-supported judgement. There will be little or no unevenness. • Focused use of a range of relevant historical concepts and context to address the key issue. • The answer is clearly structured and organised. Communicates coherently, accurately and effectively. <p style="text-align: center;">13-14</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focused comparative analysis. Controlled and discriminating evaluation of content and provenance, whether integrated or treated separately. • 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. <p style="text-align: center;">15-16</p>
Level 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Largely comparative evaluation of the key issue with a balanced and supported judgement. There may be a little unevenness in parts. • Focused use of some relevant historical context with a good conceptual understanding to address the key issue. • The answer is well structured and organised. Communicates clearly. <p style="text-align: center;">11-12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant comparative analysis of content and evaluation of provenance but there may be some unevenness in coverage or control. • Source evaluation is reasonably full and appropriate but lacks completeness on the issues raised by the sources in the light of the question. <p style="text-align: center;">13-14</p>

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

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

Question (b) Maximum mark 70

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

Marking Grid for Question (b)

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"> - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied. 	<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>
<p>Level 1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Sharply focused use and control of a range of reliable evidence to confirm, qualify, extend or question the sources. • Coherent organised structure. Accurate and effective communication. <p style="text-align: center;">20-22</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A carefully grouped and comparative evaluation of all the sources with effective levels of discrimination sharply focused on the interpretation. • 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. • 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. <p style="text-align: center;">42-48</p>
<p>Level 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • A focused use of relevant evidence to put the sources into context. • Mostly coherent structure and organisation if uneven in parts. Good communication. <p style="text-align: center;">17-19</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grouped analysis and use of most of the sources with good levels of discrimination and a reasonable focus on the interpretation. • 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. • 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. <p style="text-align: center;">35-41</p>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
Level 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Some relevant evidence but less effectively used and may not be extensive. • Reasonably coherent structure and organisation but uneven. Reasonable communication. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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.
	13-16	28-34
Level 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Some relevant evidence is deployed, but evidence will vary in accuracy, relevance and extent. It may be generalised or tangential. • Structure is less organised, communication less clear and some inaccuracies of expression. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources are discussed discretely and largely sequentially, perhaps within very basic groups. Loses focus on the interpretation. The sources are frequently described. • May mention some limitations of individual sources but largely uses them for reference and illustration. Cross referencing is unlikely. • 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.
	9-12	21-27
Level 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little argument or explanation, inaccurate understanding of the issues and concepts. The answer lacks judgement. • Limited use of relevant evidence or context which is largely inaccurate or irrelevant. • Structure is disorganised, communication basic and the sense not always clear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited attempt to use the sources or discriminate between them. The approach is very sequential and referential, with much description. Points are undeveloped. • There is little attempt to analyse, explain or use the sources in relation to the question. Comment may be general. • There is a marked imbalance with no synthesis. Analysis and explanation are rare and comments are unconvincing.
	5-8	14-20

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
Level 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is very little explanation or understanding. Largely assertion, description and narrative with no judgement. Extremely limited relevance to the question. • Evidence is basic, generalised, patchy, inaccurate or irrelevant. • Little organisation or structure with poor communication. <p style="text-align: center;">3-4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very weak and partial use of the sources for the question. No focus on interpretation. • A very weak, general and paraphrased use of source content. • No synthesis or balance. Comments are entirely unconvincing. <p style="text-align: center;">7-13</p>
Level 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No argument or explanation. Fragmentary and descriptive with no relevance to the question. • No understanding underpins what little use is made of evidence or context. • Disorganised and partial with weak communication and expression. <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little application of the sources to the question with inaccuracies and irrelevant comment. Fragmentary and heavily descriptive. • No attempt to use any aspect of the sources appropriately. • No contextual knowledge, synthesis or balance. There is no attempt to convince. <p style="text-align: center;">0-6</p>

The First Crusade and the Crusader States 1073–1130

1 The Knights Templar

(a) Study Sources B and D.

Compare these Sources as evidence for the way in which the Knights Templar were founded. [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 agree that the order began in Jerusalem to defend it against the Saracens and was devoted to the Holy Sepulchre. Both suggest that they undertook a vow of obedience to a master. In both cases they are lay knights, attracted by the cause, who had abandoned their own property.

The Sources also **differ** in that B specifically refers to the giving up of worldly possessions, whereas D implies it. B suggests the approval of the Pope who confirmed their rules (in 1128-29), whereas D ascribes the initiative to Baldwin and the Patriarch of Jerusalem (in 1119). D mentions gifts to the order (‘lands and castles’), which B does not (‘they cut themselves off from possessions’). The account in D seems to indicate, at least initially, a more disorganised approach, with the knights lazing their time away until they decided to be more purposeful.

The **provenance** and **context** of the Sources should be used to evaluate these similarities and differences. Both writers are aiming to inform their readers, with, in A, the bishop enlightening the Pope and in Source D the purpose being the benefit of French readers, who had an interest in the activities of Baldwin. One Source is German and the other French which would suggest their accounts, from widely different areas, are reliable where they agree (Jerusalem and the Holy Sepulchre and its defence). However they are vague as to who founded and authorised them and precisely when this happened (a group of knights who got together through idleness or devotion; recognition from Patriarch and King; Papal recognition). From the purpose for which they are written they are likely to be favourable accounts, although Source D does date from a period when the Templars were coming to be criticised more and this may explain its more robust approach and tone (‘eating, drinking, not working’; lands and castles) in contrast to the more reverential comments in B.

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

(b) Study all the Sources.

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the military orders benefited the crusading movement. [70]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the 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 upon the terms of the question, but no set conclusion is expected.

Three of the Sources do largely suggest that the Orders had a beneficial impact on the Crusades. Sources C and E differ.

The **supporting** view that they were beneficial for their fighting capability is clear. In Source A they fight religiously, in Source B under a vow of obedience and in Source D in battle. Source A goes on to assert that the defenders of the church were in decline until the Templars were established, although the existence of the crusading movement might seem to contradict this statement. Source A is concerned to justify the gift being made and so is likely to make out that the Templars were much needed. Source A emphasises the religious nature of the Order, ascribing its establishment to the Holy Spirit. Source B shows that the Templars have made personal sacrifices to fight, leaving their lands and possessions and costly clothes as well as their families. Source D rather tempers this with the reference to them doing very little and spending money.

The authors of both Sources A and D had personal experience of the Crusades and the author of Source B was clearly in favour of the movement, so they are hardly unbiased observers.

The **opposing** argument is found in Sources C and E which are much less impressed by the Templars and consider they soon began to lose sight of their original aims. 1127 is not long after their foundation and Source E refers to after 1100. Source A supports the fact that they were gaining gifts as Simon made this grant in 1130, although he clearly feels they are meritorious. In Source C even the wearing of the red cross is implied to be exhibitionist. Source C goes on to outline their great wealth and widespread possessions, although this is rumoured rather than known for a fact. Source C puts their decline partly down to their withdrawal from obedience to the patriarch and as Sources B and D stressed the value of the vow of obedience this could be a valid point. Source D points out that lands and castles have been bestowed on the Orders and candidates could expand on the extent of their possessions. Source E makes other accusations, that they were proud and greedy, lived an easy life on money that had been given for other purposes, did not concentrate on defending the Holy Places and even attacked fellow Christians. William of Tyre is careful to qualify what he asserts which might make it seem more reliable and Source E is not sensational in its criticisms. Candidates might feel that the accusations against the Templars which brought them down in the fourteenth century, have coloured modern attitudes to them.

Candidates might compare the military orders with the monastic which also declined as time went on or refer to the inevitable diminution of enthusiasm as time passed and the possible sapping of virtue by an eastern life style.

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

The German Reformation 1517–1555

2 The German Cities and Religious Reform in the 1530s

(a) Study Sources A and D

Compare these Sources as evidence for attitudes towards religious reform in German cities in the 1530s. [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 **content** of the Sources refers to religious reform in the light of defence of cities from the same outside attack. The Sources **agree** that cities are in danger of attack. **Source D** refers to 'the ruin of the city' which might result from defying the Emperor and upsetting the powerful Bishop of Speyer, and **Source A** to 'attack on account of the Word of God' which own knowledge might explain to be not only the Emperor but also Catholic princes. **Knowledge** might be used to explain the context of the Emperor's reaffirmation of the Edict of Worms, the Protest of 1529 and the Augsburg Confession of 1530. Whereas **Source A** is a plan for joint defence against attack from only outside forces, **Source D** refers also to the dangers of internal disturbances and 'trouble and expense'. This is because they **disagree** on the need to adopt Lutheran reform. Whereas in **Source A** the motive is spiritual – to have the pure Word of God preached as the duty for every Christian government. In **Source D** social and economic motives seem to predominate. Whereas in **Source A** preaching is seen as enlightening the urban populace in **Source D** it is seen as divisive, with preachers seeking self-interest and undermining the law for their own ends, so that the magistrates fear losing their authority. Their lack of authority might be explained by the fact that their prince-bishop is mentioned but they refer to no supportive secular prince except the Emperor, unlike **Source A**.

The **provenance** and **context** of the Sources should be used to evaluate these similarities and differences. In **Source A** the urban signatories are from 11 Lutheran cities and are backed by powerful Lutheran princes. Own **knowledge** might be used to explain that these included Philip of Hesse and John Frederick of Saxony, though the signatories do not seem confident as they add 'as best they can', which might be inferred to mean that the opposing Catholic forces are feared to be stronger. In contrast, the authors of **Source D** might be inferred to be far less powerful, as they fear the prince-bishop and the Emperor. They mention that reformers have generally interfered with the law and won the support of the 'common herd', becoming too strong for city authorities to control. This might, of course, be an excuse as their **purpose** might be to prevent their power being eroded by democratic pressure or their economy weakened. **Knowledge** is unlikely to be provided about the Imperial Court of Chancery being situated in Speyer after 1527 but it may be known that Diets were held there, giving the city prosperity and a high profile. **Source A** might be seen as more typical of a response by Lutheran cities, as 11 are represented, whereas in **Source D** Speyer has particular local factors to consider. As **Source A** is an official document of alliance and **Source D** merely a memorandum, the former might be considered more useful, though the latter perhaps more honest about its fears. Its **tone** is more emotive and blunt – 'common herd', deeply suspected' 'defying' – than the vulnerability and idealism of **Source A** 'so pleasing to God' 'duty of a Christian government'. **Source D** was also written at a later date when the authors are able to reflect on the problems arising from reform in other cities, including Münster.

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 the German cities actively aided the survival of Lutheranism in the 1530s. [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 contain references to different interpretations, so they may be grouped according to their view. The **supporting** view, that German cities played an active part in the survival of Lutheranism, is in **Sources A, C and E**, together with the provenance of **B**. The **opposing** view, that they hindered its survival, is in **Sources B and D**.

The **supporting** argument, that German city authorities helped the survival of Lutheranism, is in the content of **Source A**. Eleven cities join the Protestant princes in signing the terms of the Schmalkaldic League to collectively defend themselves militarily. The content suggests religious motives, seeing God's will in the preaching of the gospel. **Knowledge** of religious divisions within the Empire and the threat to the survival of Lutheranism posed by the Emperor, Catholic princes and the Edict of Worms might be used in evaluation. The Schmalkaldic War did not break out during this period, but the League had deterrent value, enabling negotiation with the Emperor. It supported the spread of Lutheranism in both the north and south of Germany. The **provenance** of **Source A** suggests that the cities had powerful backing from Lutheran princes. Knowledge might be used to explain the roles of Philip of Hesse and John Frederick of Saxony in the League. The provenance of **Source B** also supports this argument, as the authorities of the city of Düsseldorf, reporting to the Duke of Cleves, are successfully hunting radicals whose activities undermine the survival of more moderate Lutheranism. It is not expected that any detail of the Duke's views will be known, but comments on his moderate stance should be rewarded. The argument is also supported in **Sources C and E**. In **Source C**, Luther is pleased at the success of the city authorities of Augsburg in establishing Lutheranism in the light of disputes with a previous Zwinglian majority and 'eradicating all offence'. He sees a propaganda opportunity in **Source C**, 'publicly printed to the praise of God' to encourage other councils to accept the Lutheran Augsburg Confession of 1530. Some answers may observe their **knowledge** of this **date** to point out that it took six years for Augsburg to accept the Confession named after it at the Diet. It might also be mentioned that the city of Augsburg was rich and powerful, and able to help convert surrounding towns and countryside. **Source E** is a modern historian writing more generally about the success of Lutheranism in the cities, and their part in establishing it as an urban phenomenon not just a state-sponsored faith. He sees the advantages of the compact nature of cities for the survival of Lutheranism: speed and numbers converted, social pressure for religious change and as strongholds for defence posing strategic problems for Catholic princes. These views might be evaluated by cross-reference with the other Sources. For examples, the tone of **Source A** is less confident – 'come to his aid, as best they can'. Written at the foundation of the League, the signatories do not underestimate the danger posed by their Catholic opponents – success was by no means a foregone conclusion. The speed and numbers converted in cities might also prove a negative factor when social pressure was for radical reform as it was in Münster in **Source B**.

The **opposing** argument, that some cities actively hindered the survival of Lutheranism, is in **Sources D and B**. The magistrates of the city of Speyer will not bow to the wishes of 'self-interested' preachers or the 'common herd' as they fear that acting without the permission of the bishop will lead to a loss of their power. Defiance of the Emperor by establishing Lutheranism might cause 'the ruin of the city', which might perhaps be inferred to mean the loss of its prestige and damage to its economy. In **Source B**, radical Anabaptism of Münster undermined the survival of moderate Lutheranism by associating religious reform with near anarchy, but the situation was temporary. In this case, a city as 'defensive stronghold' acted against moderate Lutheranism, as it took a siege to end the Anabaptist rebellion which had overthrown the Lutheran preacher who had ousted the Catholic prince-bishop. The leaders were uneducated common people who denied the gospel and the sacrament, and performed adult baptism. **Knowledge** of events in Münster might be for used both **for and against** the interpretation in the question, as its example turned people away from extremism and gave Lutherans a common cause with the Catholic bishop in crushing the regime there, strengthening moderate support for Lutheranism and discrediting their radical opponents.

The **provenance** of the Sources should be integrated into the discussion. **Source A** is an official statement of intent, emphasising the religious nature as the common **purpose** of the cities' alliance with the princes, but does not mention the impact of the league. **Knowledge** should focus on the 1530s and not stray into the later events of the Schmalkaldic War. The untypicality and local nature of **Sources B, C and D** might be pointed out. The positive tone of Luther's letter in **Source C** might be compared to the negative tone of **Source D**, ('terrible disturbance' possibly a response to Münster), and the more generalised and superficial approach of the secondary **Source E**. The overall judgement on the interpretation might conclude that support from a local secular leader, whether prince or prince-bishop, played a part in the city's role in regard to Lutheranism. Luther himself played a part in winning over the more independent and powerful city of Augsburg, which itself then influenced others.

Supported overall **judgement** should be reached on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation that German cities actively helped the survival of Lutheranism in the 1530s. 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

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