

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

GCE HISTORY A

Unit F964: *European and World History*
Enquiries

Option A: *Medieval and Early Modern 1073-1546*

Specimen Paper

F964 QP

Morning/Afternoon

Time: 1 hour 30 minutes

Additional Materials: Answer Booklet (8 pages)



INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

- Write your name, Centre number and candidate number in the spaces provided on the answer book.
- Write your answers on the separate answer book provided.
- Answer **both sub-questions** from **one** Study Topic.

INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

- This paper contains questions on the following 2 Study Topics:
 - The First Crusade and the Crusader States 1073-1130
 - The German Reformation 1517-1555
- The total mark for this paper is **100**.
- The number of marks is given in brackets [] at the end of each sub-question.
- You should write in continuous prose and are reminded of the need for clear and accurate writing, including structure and argument, grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- The time permitted allows for reading the Sources in the one Option you have studied.
- In answering these questions, you are expected to use your knowledge of the topic to help you understand and interpret the Sources as well as to inform your answers.

ADVICE TO CANDIDATES

- Read each question carefully and make sure you know what you have to do before starting your answer.

This document consists of 6 printed pages and 2 blank pages.

The First Crusade and the Crusader States 1073-1130

Study the **five** Sources on Military Successes 1097-99, and then answer both the sub-questions.

It is recommended that you spend two thirds of your time in answering part **(b)**.

1 (a) Study Sources B and C

Compare these Sources as evidence for the importance of internal Muslim weaknesses during the First Crusade. [30]

(b) Study all the Sources

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the sources support the interpretation that the success of the First Crusade is best explained by the military skills of the Crusaders. [70]

[Total: 100 marks]

Military Successes 1097-99

Source A: An unknown author, who went on the First Crusade and wrote an important chronicle of the Crusades, gives an account of early Crusader success at the Battle of Dorylaeum (in modern Turkey) in July 1097.

The Turks came upon us from all sides, skirmishing, throwing javelins, and shooting arrows from an astonishing range. The women in our camp were a great help to us that day; they gallantly encouraged those who were fighting and defending them. The valiant Bohemond made haste to send a message to the others (Count Raymond of Toulouse and Duke Godfrey, Hugh the Great and the Bishop of Le Puy, with all the rest of the Christian knights), telling them to hurry to the battlefield with all speed. They did so and we won a great victory.

The Deeds of the Franks and other Pilgrims to Jerusalem, written by 1100-1101

Source B: A contemporary French writer, a priest and chaplain to Count Raymond of Toulouse, who went on the Crusade, describes the defeat of a Turkish army trying to bring aid to the besieged city of Antioch in early 1098.

The site of the battle stopped the usual Turkish encircling movements and enabled our troops to move to battle. Consequently we occupied the field. The battle began with our men at first gradually pushing forward while the Turks ran to and fro, shot their arrows, and slowly retreated. Our troops suffered heavy losses until the first line of the Turks was driven against the rear. Deserters later informed us that there were at least twenty eight thousand Turkish cavalymen in this encounter. When the hostile lines finally came together, the Franks prayed to God and rushed forward. The ever present Lord, "strong and mighty in battle", cast down the pagans. We chased them almost ten miles from the battle site to their highly fortified fortress. Upon the sight of this rout, the occupants of the castle burned it and took to flight. This outcome caused joy and jubilation because we considered the burning of the fortress as another victory.

Raymond of Aguilers, History of the French who have captured Jerusalem, written by 1105

Source C: A Muslim writer of the twelfth century gives his views of the Battle of Antioch, 28 June 1098.

When Kerbuqa heard that the Franks had taken Antioch, he advanced into Syria. All of the Turkish and Arab forces rallied to him, except for the army from Aleppo. When the Franks heard of this, they were alarmed and afraid, for their troops were weak and short of food. The Muslims confronted the Franks in front of Antioch. Kerbuqa, however, offended the Muslims by his pride and his ill-treatment of them. The Franks then came out of Antioch and in a great battle forced the Muslims to turn and flee. The Franks killed them by the thousand.

Ibn-al-Athir, The Perfect History, written in the period 1160-1234

Source D: The author of Source A describes the capture of Jerusalem in July 1099.

We who had taken the cross had reached our goal. On Friday at dawn we attacked the city from all sides. One of our knights succeeded in getting on to the wall. All the defenders fled along the walls and through the city, and our men went after them, cutting them down as far as Solomon's Temple, where there was a great massacre. After this, our men rushed round the whole city, seizing gold and silver, horses and mules, and houses full of all sorts of goods. Then they all came together rejoicing and weeping from gladness, and they fulfilled their religious vows at the Holy Sepulchre.

The Deeds of the Franks and other Pilgrims to Jerusalem, written by 1100-1101

Source E: A modern historian reviews problems faced by the opponents of the Crusaders.

There was a lack of cohesive leadership on the Islamic side. Resistance was left to local rulers and governors. Many fought hard but were individually overwhelmed. Other local leaders came to terms or even tried to form alliances with the fearsome newcomers, and the fact that some Muslim leaders thought the invaders could be used in this way illustrates their lack of understanding of what the First Crusade was all about. Such a lack of mutual support among local Muslim rulers shocked some of their own people, though it would take a long time for their successors to overcome their chronic political, ethnic and religious divisions.

David Nicolle, The Crusades, 2001, Osprey Publishing, ISBN 1841761796

The German Reformation 1517–30

Study the **five** Sources on Reactions to Luther, and then answer **both** sub-questions.

It is recommended that you spend two-thirds of your time in answering part (b).

2 (a) Study Sources A and B

Compare sources A and B as evidence for views on Luther

[30]

(b) Study all the Sources

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the sources support the interpretation that hostile reactions to Luther were caused more by his aggressive manner than his teachings.

[70]

[Total: 100 marks]

Paper Total [100]

Reactions to Luther

Source A: Luther tries to persuade the Pope that he is not a heretic and promises to accept the Pope's authority. I have heard some bad rumours that I tried to destroy the power of the Pope. I am accused of heresy and am horrified. I was inflamed with a zeal for God or perhaps a youthful enthusiasm. I have come to public attention unwillingly. I am not a great scholar but have a stupid mind and little education. Therefore, I dedicate everything that I am and have to you.

Approve my work or reject it as you decide.

Luther, introduction to his 'Resolutions', a book dedicated to Pope Leo X, 1518

Source B: A humanist and Lutheran sympathiser assesses the qualities shown by Luther at the debate with Eck at Leipzig in 1519. Martin Luther is so learned in the Bible that he has almost memorised all of it. He understands enough Greek and Hebrew to judge translations of the Bible. He is civilised and friendly in his daily life and manners. There is nothing superior about him. He makes jokes and always has a happy face, however hard his enemies press him. You would hardly believe that he is such a great man. But people find fault with him because he is too extreme in responding to criticism.

Peter Mosellanus, letter to Julius Pflug, December 1519

Source C: A Polish diplomat and humanist, in a letter to the Bishop of Posen, gives his impressions of Luther.

I did not want to pass up the chance to see Luther, who was then not far away in Wittenberg. I went with Melanchthon to see him after dinner. Luther stood up and offered me his hand and bade me to be seated. We sat down and discussed various issues for four hours. I found the man witty, learned and eloquent, except that he had little to say of the pope, the emperor and some of the princes other than abuse and arrogant accusations. His eyes are sharp and have a strange sparkle; his speech is full of mockery and taunts.

Johannes Dantiscus, letter to Johann Latafski, August 1523

Source D: Erasmus, the leading Catholic humanist, writes angrily after Luther had criticised him. Luther's book about me went well beyond the bounds of fair comment. It was full of sneers, insults, threats and accusations. The book has more libellous remarks in it than all his other books put together. I can tolerate being called stupid, ignorant, a drunk, a moron, retarded, and an idiot. But these were not enough for him. He went on to say that I do not believe in God. He claims that I despise the Bible, and am an enemy of Christianity and a hypocrite. He has no idea how many people have been revolted by his rude words. Are his teasing, his vicious jokes, threats and deceit really appropriate for such an important matter?

Erasmus, letter to the Elector of Saxony, March 1526

Source E: A well-informed report of the argument between Luther and other reformers at a meeting called to resolve religious disputes between Protestants. These disputes included disagreements about the Lord's Supper or Eucharist. Zwingli was a leading Swiss religious reformer.

Zwingli: You won't give ground because you are prejudiced and have already made up your mind. You won't yield until somebody quotes a passage in the Bible. We agree on the most important points and I beg you in Christ's name not to call somebody a heretic because of other differences. We both agree that it is impossible for God to order us to eat Christ's flesh at the Lord's Supper in a physical sense. Don't be offended by what I say. I disagree with you in a friendly manner. Do not use exaggerated language.

Luther: The only way to settle the argument between us is for you to keep God's word and agree with me.

Report on the Debate at Marburg (also known as The Colloquy of Marburg), October 1529

Copyright Acknowledgements:

Sources

Source E: David Nicolle, *The Crusades*, 2001, © Osprey Publishing, ISBN 1841761796

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (OCR) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest opportunity.

OCR is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.

© OCR 2007

SPECIMEN

SPECIMEN

The maximum mark for this paper is 100.

SPECIMEN

AS UNIT F964 European and World Historical Enquiries

Maximum mark 100. 1 answer: 2 parts.

Question (a) Maximum mark 30

	A01a	A01b	AO2a
IA	6	8	16
IB	6	7	13-15
II	5	6	11-12
III	4	5	9-10
IV	3	4	7-8
V	2	3	5-6
VI	1	2	3-4
VII	0	0-1	0-2

Notes related to Question (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 fall at the same level for each AO

Question (b) Maximum mark 70

	A01a	A01b	AO2a	AO2b
IA	9-10	11-12	26-28	20
IB	8	9-10	23-25	17-19
II	7	8	20-22	14-16
III	6	6-7	17-19	11-13
IV	4-5	4-5	14-16	8-10
V	3	3	11-13	6-7
VI	2	2	5-10	3-5
VII	0-1	0-1	0-4	0-2

Notes related to Question (b):

- (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	AO1b	AO2a
Total for each question = 30	Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.	Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of: - 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 IA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accurate use of a range of appropriate historical terminology • Answer is clearly structured and coherent; communicates accurately and legibly. <p style="text-align: center;">6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answer is consistently and relevantly analytical with developed comparison and judgement • Clear and accurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Clear and accurate understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context <p style="text-align: center;">8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response provides a focused comparison and/or contrast of both content and provenance • Evaluates qualities such as reliability, completeness, consistency, typicality, and especially utility, in relation to the question. <p style="text-align: center;">16</p>
Level IB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accurate use of a range of appropriate historical terminology • Answer is clearly structured and coherent; communicates accurately and legibly <p style="text-align: center;">6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judgements are supported by appropriate references to both content and provenance. • Very good level of understanding of key concepts. • Clear and accurate understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context. <p style="text-align: center;">7</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response provides an effective comparison and/or contrast of both content and provenance • Evaluates a range of qualities of authenticity, completeness, consistency, typicality and usefulness in relation to the question. <p style="text-align: center;">13-15</p>
Level II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally accurate use of historical terminology • Answer is structured and mostly coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear <p style="text-align: center;">5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good attempt at explanation/ analysis but uneven overall judgements. • Mostly clear and accurate understanding of key concepts • Clear understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context. <p style="text-align: center;">6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a relevant comparison and/ or contrast of both content and provenance. • Answer lacks completeness in evaluating most of the range of available criteria (eg. limited use of the introductions and/ or attributions) <p style="text-align: center;">11-12</p>

Level III	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answer includes relevant historical terminology but this may not be extensive or always accurately used • Most of the answer is organised and structured; the answer is mostly legible and clearly communicated <p style="text-align: center;">4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A mixture of internal analysis and discussion of similarities and/or differences. A judgement is unlikely. • Some/uneven understanding of many key concepts relevant to analysis and of many concepts relevant to the topic • Uneven understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context. <p style="text-align: center;">5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a comparison and/ or contrast • Makes limited links with the sources by focusing too much on content or on provenance • The organisation is uneven, confining the comparison to the second half of the answer or simply to a concluding paragraph <p style="text-align: center;">9-10</p>
Level IV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There may be some evidence that is tangential or irrelevant • Some unclear and/or under-developed and/or disorganised sections; mostly satisfactory level of communication <p style="text-align: center;">3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mostly satisfactory understanding of key concepts. • Mostly satisfactory explanation but some unlinked though relevant assertions, description / narrative • There is no judgement <p style="text-align: center;">4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response attempts a comparison and/or contrast but the comment is largely sequential • Few points of comparative provenance or discussion of similarity/difference of content <p style="text-align: center;">7-8</p>
Level V	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There may be inaccuracies and irrelevant material. • Some accurate use of relevant historical terminology but often inaccurate/ inappropriate use • Often unclear and disorganised sections; writing will often be clear if basic but there may be some illegibility and weak prose where the sense is not clear or obvious <p style="text-align: center;">2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General and sometimes inaccurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to the topic • General or weak understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context <p style="text-align: center;">3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies some points of agreement and/or disagreement • The comparison and/or contrast is implicit • There is no judgement <p style="text-align: center;">5-6</p>
Level VI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be much irrelevance and inaccuracy • Answer may have little organisation or structure; weak use of English and poor organisation <p style="text-align: center;">1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited explanation but mainly description / narrative • Very little understanding of key concepts. <p style="text-align: center;">2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very weak commentary on one point of agreement/ disagreement • Sources may be paraphrased with no real attempt to compare and/or contrast <p style="text-align: center;">3-4</p>
Level VII	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements • Totally irrelevant answer • Very poor use of English <p style="text-align: center;">0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak explanation, and descriptive / narrative commentary on the sources • No understanding of key concepts <p style="text-align: center;">0-1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No attempt to provide a comparison and/or contrast • Sources are paraphrased or copied out <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>

Marking Grid for Question (b)

AOs	AO1a	AO1b	AO2a	AO2b
Level IB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses accurate, detailed and relevant evidence • Accurate use of a range of appropriate historical terminology • Answer is clearly structured and mostly coherent; writes accurately and legibly <p style="text-align: center;">8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and accurate understanding of most key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Clear understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context. • Judgements are supported by appropriate references to both content and provenance. <p style="text-align: center;">9-10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focussed analysis and evaluation of all sources with high levels of discrimination. • Analyses and evaluates the limitations of the sources and what is required to add to their completeness as a set <p style="text-align: center;">23-25</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focussed analysis and evaluation of the historical interpretation using all sources and own knowledge to reach a clear conclusion • Understands that the sources may either support or refute the interpretation <p style="text-align: center;">17-19</p>
Level II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses mostly accurate, detailed and relevant evidence which demonstrates a competent command of the topic • Generally accurate use of historical terminology • Answer is structured and mostly coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear <p style="text-align: center;">7</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mostly clear and accurate understanding of key concepts • Clear understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context. • Good attempt at explanation/ analysis but uneven overall judgements. <p style="text-align: center;">8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focussed analysis and evaluation of most of the sources with good levels of discrimination • Analyses and evaluates some of the limitations of the sources and what is required to add to their completeness as a set <p style="text-align: center;">20-22</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focussed analysis and evaluation of the historical interpretation using most of the sources and appropriate own knowledge to reach a clear conclusion • There may be some imbalance between discussion of the sources and use of external knowledge in evaluating the interpretation <p style="text-align: center;">14-16</p>
Level III	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses accurate and relevant evidence which demonstrates some command of the topic <i>but there may be some inaccuracy</i> • Answer includes relevant historical terminology but this may not be extensive or always accurately used • Most of the answer is organised and structured; the answer is mostly legible and clearly communicated <p style="text-align: center;">6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows a sound understanding of key concepts. • Sound awareness of the significance of issues in their historical context • Attempts an explanation/ analysis but overall judgement may be incomplete <p style="text-align: center;">6-7</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refers to most of the sources to illustrate an argument rather than analysing and evaluating their evidence • Aware of some of the sources' limitations either individually or as a set <p style="text-align: center;">17-19</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sound analysis and evaluation of the historical interpretation. • There may be some description and unevenness between use of own knowledge and use of sources • Answers which use the sources but no own knowledge in assessing the interpretation have a Level III ceiling <p style="text-align: center;">11-13</p>

Level IV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is deployment of relevant knowledge but level/ accuracy of detail will vary; there may be some evidence that is tangential or irrelevant • Some unclear and/or under-developed and/or disorganised sections; mostly satisfactory level of communication <p style="text-align: center;">4-5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mostly satisfactory understanding of key concepts • Some explanation but not always linked to the question • Assertions, description / narrative will characterise part of the answer <p style="text-align: center;">4-5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources are discussed sequentially. • Considers some of the limitations of the sources; but may not establish a sense of different views <p style="text-align: center;">14-16</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some analysis and evaluation of the historical interpretation with increasing amounts of description. • Response is more imbalanced than Level III in using sources and own knowledge • Answers that use own knowledge but make no use of the sources in assessing the interpretation have a Level IV ceiling <p style="text-align: center;">8-10</p>
Level V	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some relevant historical knowledge deployed: this may be generalised and patchy. There may be inaccuracies and irrelevant material • Some accurate use of relevant historical terminology but often inaccurate/ inappropriate use • Often unclear and disorganized sections; writing will often be basic and there may be some illegibility and weak prose where the sense is not clear or obvious <p style="text-align: center;">3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General and sometimes inaccurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to the topic • General or weak understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context <p style="text-align: center;">3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited attempt to use the sources or discriminate between them; they are discussed sequentially • Sources will be used for reference and illustration of an argument <p style="text-align: center;">11-13</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mainly description with limited comment on the context of the question • Little effective analysis of how far the sources support the interpretation <p style="text-align: center;">6-7</p>
Level VI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of relevant evidence will be limited; there will be much irrelevance and inaccuracy • Answer may have little organisation or structure • Weak use of English and poor organisation <p style="text-align: center;">2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very little understanding of key concepts. • No explanation. • Assertion, description / narrative predominate <p style="text-align: center;">2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak application of the sources to the question • Weak attempt at analysis <p style="text-align: center;">5-10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak contextual knowledge • Mainly description with weak evaluation of the historical interpretation <p style="text-align: center;">3-5</p>
Level VII	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements; little relevant and accurate knowledge • Very fragmentary and disorganised response; very poor use of English and some incoherence <p style="text-align: center;">0-1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No understanding of key concepts • Weak explanation, assertion, description / narrative <p style="text-align: center;">0-1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very weak application of the sources to the question • No attempt at analysis <p style="text-align: center;">0-4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very weak attempt at evaluating the historical interpretation • Heavily descriptive • No contextual knowledge <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
<p>1(b) cont'd</p>	<p>Military skills are touched on in Sources A and B and, more indirectly, in Source D. Sources B, C and E point to other factors. The notion of heroic resistance and valiant fighting skills and determination are conveyed. 'Own' knowledge could be used to highlight important tactics, e.g. use of cavalry; use of dismounted forces; skilled use of archers; ability to withstand Muslim charges and break-up advances; successful siege techniques. Source C points up Muslim weaknesses that helped at Antioch and Source E reinforces this as a factor, developing some features. Source B suggests that Muslim discipline and tactics could be overcome by fierce determination and prayer to God. Source A touches on crusade leaders, such as Bohemond and Raymond. Sources A and D highlight religious inspiration and zeal. Source D makes much of fulfilling crusading vows and Sources A and B reflect a sense of divine intervention and inspiration. These Sources can be linked to evidence of religious fervour and inspiration during the Crusade, at Antioch (the Holy Lance episode) and Jerusalem (procession outside the city). Candidates might comment on the tone of some Sources, not least A and D. A, B, and D are Christian writers and tend to give prominence to religious zeal and providence, commenting perhaps only indirectly on military skills (strategy, tactics) as such whilst C and E stress Muslim weakness, both strengthening as evidence given their Islamic and modern perceptions. 'Own' knowledge can support military strategy and tactics, ranging from the early success at Doryleum to the successful sieges of Antioch and Jerusalem. Sources B and C together suggest some of the reasons for success at Antioch. Such knowledge can also supply detail on leadership, above all secular, no matter at times the sharp dissensions (e.g. Bohemond of Taranto, Raymond of Toulouse, Godfrey of Bouillon) and on religious motivation and zeal. The leadership skills of Bohemond and Raymond, for example, were important, if in contrasting ways. Limited Byzantine help, more so early on, might be considered, as might the weaknesses of opponents (Sources C and E). Candidates might, for example, refer to issues such as: Sunni-Shi'ite divisions, tensions between Aleppo and Damascus, Turks and Egyptians. Sources B, C and E testify to some weaknesses as well as to the depths of those tensions and divisions. Candidates are likely to consider a range of factors, whether military, religious or political (leadership), and are likely to see some balance between Crusader skills, developing strategy and tactics and problems faced by their opponents. Religious fervour may be adduced and it is up to candidates to assess and decide</p>	<p>[70]</p>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
	upon relative importance here, there being no set conclusion.	
<p data-bbox="300 607 320 636">2</p> <p data-bbox="284 680 336 710">2(a)</p>	<p data-bbox="405 607 863 636">The German Reformation 1517-30</p> <p data-bbox="405 680 724 710">Study Sources A and B</p> <p data-bbox="405 719 1209 748">Compare sources A and B as evidence for views on Luther</p> <p data-bbox="405 757 863 786"><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</u></p> <p data-bbox="405 795 1225 958">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> <p data-bbox="405 967 1235 1487">Source A is from Luther’s own writings and the text shows his great concern not to offend Pope Leo X. At that stage (1518), he had not developed his (later) extreme anti-papal views and it is true that he was surprised by reactions to the views he expressed in the 95 Theses. Candidates might comment on his self-deprecating attitude confirmed in both Sources and perhaps question the complete sincerity of what Luther says. Source B, written over a year later, is sympathetic to Luther. Mosellanus has a high regard for Luther’s intellectual abilities – which certainly contrasts with Luther own very modest description of himself. The final claim in Source B that Luther is too extreme in his response to criticism challenges Luther’s claims in Source A to moderation and raises questions as to whether he really would accept the judgement of the Pope. Both Sources agree that Luther faced major hostility and that provides some context to the pressures he was under.</p>	<p data-bbox="1278 1458 1331 1487">[30]</p>
<p data-bbox="284 1576 336 1606">2(b)</p> <p data-bbox="268 1615 352 1644">cont’d</p>	<p data-bbox="405 1576 703 1606">Study all the sources.</p> <p data-bbox="405 1615 1187 1742">Use your own knowledge to assess how far the sources support the interpretation that hostile reactions to Luther were caused more by his aggressive manner than his teachings.</p> <p data-bbox="405 1751 1203 1816">Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</p> <p data-bbox="405 1825 1225 1951">Successful answers will need to make use of all four 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</p>	

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
	<p>question but no set conclusion is expected.</p> <p>Sources D and E confirm the claim and whilst one can doubt the absolute reliability of Source D as being Erasmus's impression, Source E is a reputable account of the exchanges in the 1529 debate between Luther and Zwingli. But Source B also refers to Luther's unwillingness to accept criticism and it is useful because it is written by somebody who sympathised with him. Luther's bonhomie only went so far.</p> <p>Source A gives a different side, but it was written at an early stage in the quarrel with the Papacy so it can be used to demonstrate Luther's developing ideas. In using their own knowledge, candidates can use Luther's responses on successive occasions e.g. the debates with Eck and with Cardinal Cajetan, and at the Diet of Worms. Luther was also unwilling to moderate his stance in relation to other reformers whether catholic (e.g. Erasmus, Source D) or reformed (e.g. Zwingli, Source E); some may point out that Erasmus, the author of Source D, was sympathetic to quite a lot of Luther's views. On the other hand, it can be argued that he was pushed into a corner in 1519-21 by Catholic authorities who insisted on his denial of his writings and who probably saw wider heretical implications in them than Luther intended. Equally, it can be argued that he was pushed from the other side by more radical reformers, e.g. Karlstadt. Luther felt that he had to shout loudly to make it clear that his teachings did not encourage rebellion and did not threaten the social order (especially during and after the Peasants War 1524-26). Perhaps aggression was, in part, necessary for the defence of Lutheran teachings as 'moderate'. Sources A and E could also be used to demonstrate hostility arising from his teachings. In A there is the attack on papal authority, in E his controversial views on Transubstantiation which threatened to split reformers' religion.</p> <p>Source C appears to take a balanced view of Luther being aware of his charm and qualities as well as the more abrasive aspects of his personality. That the author was a humanist (as well as a diplomat) is useful as is the fact that he met Luther face to face on the reformer's home ground of Wittenberg. Luther's charm as recorded in Source C compares with what is said about him in Source B whilst the impressions of abusiveness, accusations and mockery are shared by Erasmus in Source D. Candidates could also use Source C to emphasis the importance of Luther's teachings. Central to Dantiscus' visit is the four hour discussion, no doubt of importance to a humanist.</p>	[70]
	Paper Total	[100]