

**GCE**

**History A**

**Y237/01: The German reformation and the rule of Charles V**

1500-1559

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

**Mark Scheme for June 2019**

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2019

These are the annotations, (including abbreviations), including those used in scoris, which are used when marking

Annotation	Meaning of annotation
<b>BP</b>	Blank Page
	Highlight
Off-page comment	
<b>A</b>	Assertion
<b>AN</b>	Analysis
<b>EVAL</b>	Evaluation
<b>EXP</b>	Explanation
<b>F</b>	Factor
<b>ILL</b>	Illustrates/Describes
<b>IRRL</b>	Irrelevant, a significant amount of material that does not answer the question
<b>J</b>	Judgement
<b>KU</b>	Knowledge and understanding
<b>P</b>	Provenance
<b>SC</b>	Simple comment
	Unclear
<b>V</b>	View

## MARK SCHEME Section A

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
1*	<p><b>How far did Lutheranism threaten the unity of the Holy Roman Empire in the years 1517-1529?</b></p> <p><b>In arguing that Lutheranism did threaten the unity of the Holy Roman Empire,</b> answers might consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The rapid spread of Luther’s ideas in this period and the threat they posed to the traditional Catholic authority which had united the Holy Roman Empire.</li> <li>• The impossibility of finding a compromise to reconcile Luther with the Catholic Church, indicating the insoluble nature of the problem.</li> <li>• The decision taken by powerful figures like Albrecht of Hohenzollern, Philip of Hesse and Elector Frederick the Wise to support Luther, despite the opposition of the Pope, Charles V and other princes.</li> <li>• The geographical and rural/urban divisions emerging between areas which supported Luther and those which maintained Catholic authority.</li> <li>• The challenges that the spread of Lutheran ideas posed to traditional social and political structures, resulting in social unrest in the Knights’ and Peasants’ Wars, as well as more local disturbances.</li> <li>• The opportunity which Lutheranism presented for individual states to use it as an issue over which they could assert their autonomy and challenge the central authority of the Emperor.</li> </ul> <p><b>In arguing that it was not a serious threat to unity up to 1529,</b> answers might consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The weaknesses of Luther and Lutheranism up to 1529.</li> </ul>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No set answer is expected.</li> <li>• At Level 5 there will be judgement as to the relative level of threat.</li> <li>• At level 5 answers might establish criteria against which to judge the degree of threat.</li> <li>• To be valid, judgements must be supported by relevant and accurate material. If not, they are assertions.</li> <li>• Knowledge must not be credited in isolation, it should only be credited where it is used as the basis for analysis and evaluation, in line with descriptions in the levels mark scheme.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Luther’s inherent conservatism, resisting the social unrest exemplified in the Peasants’ Wars, any forceful or radical implementation of religious reform and being cautious about the political alliances he entered.</li> <li>• The limits to the geographical spread of Lutheranism, and the differences in interpretation and impact in different areas – it did not represent a homogenous ‘opposition’ to Catholic authority yet.</li> <li>• The fact that there had always been tensions over the political cohesion of the Holy Roman Empire and the balance of power between individual states and the central authority of the Emperor; the lukewarm support for Lutheranism from many princes up to 1529 indicates that they had little certainty of its longevity and may have simply been using it as leverage in the relationship between state and centre.</li> <li>• The financial and military resources available to Charles V to restore Catholic authority and the strong incentive for the Pope and other Catholic monarchs to support him in this.</li> <li>• Ongoing attempts to find a compromise, indicating that both sides felt that this might still be possible and that divisions may not be permanent.</li> </ul>		
2.*		<p><b>‘In his dealings with the Ottomans Charles V was primarily motivated by the defence of his Spanish and Italian territories.’ How far do you agree?</b></p> <p><b>In arguing that Charles’ policy against the Ottomans was mainly motivated by his desire to defend his Spanish and Italian territories, answers might consider:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The size and scale of the Ottoman naval fleet as compared to the resources available to Charles V, which meant that he may struggle to repel a direct attack on</li> </ul>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No set answer is expected.</li> <li>• At Level 5 there will be judgement as to the relative importance of the motives.</li> <li>• At level 5 answers might establish criteria against which to judge the importance of the motives.</li> <li>• To be valid, judgements must be supported by relevant and accurate material. If not, they are assertions.</li> <li>• Knowledge must not be credited in isolation, it should only be credited where it is used as the basis for analysis and evaluation, in line with descriptions in the levels mark</li> </ul>

		<p>Italy or Spain (as happened when the Ottoman force reached Rome).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The repeated raids on the Spanish and Italian coasts, and the greater risk posed after the alliance between the Ottomans and the Barbary Corsairs.</li> <li>• The strategic importance of the Mediterranean for travel and trade between the Spanish and Italian territories, making the presence of the Ottoman fleet there a significant problem.</li> <li>• Charles’ absolute determination to hold on to his Italian territories, as signalled not only by his campaign against the Ottomans but also his ongoing conflict with France.</li> <li>• His lukewarm interest in campaigning against the Ottomans in Eastern Europe as compared to his greater determination in the Mediterranean.</li> <li>• Charles’ fears that the Barbary/Ottoman forces could unite with the <i>Moriscos</i> in Spain to create a domestic uprising.</li> </ul> <p><b>In arguing that other motives were more important, answers might consider:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the Ottomans did not pose a serious threat to inland areas of Spain and Italy as they did not have the resources to conduct such an ambitious campaign so far away from the imperial centre.</li> <li>• Religious motives and the threat that Muslim expansion posed to the supremacy of Christendom, which Charles as Holy Roman Emperor was bound to defend.</li> <li>• Family connections, and Charles’ obligations to Ferdinand in Eastern Europe.</li> <li>• The need to defend the Eastern flank of the Holy Roman Empire from Ottoman expansion there.</li> <li>• Financial and trading motives, as the Mediterranean remained an absolutely crucial waterway for trade and</li> </ul>		<p>scheme.</p>
--	--	--	--	----------------

		<p>communications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issues of reputation, the need to redress defeats once they had occurred and the personal glory that could be gained through victories against the Ottomans.</li> </ul>		
<p>3.</p>		<p><b>Read the interpretation and then answer the question that follows:</b></p> <p><b>‘As the Reformation took root new figures of influence emerged, and Luther's active leadership became less essential... by 1532 Luther's best years were already behind him.’</b></p> <p><b>From: A. Pettegree, ‘The Execution of Martin Luther’, <i>History Review Issue 24</i>, published in March 1996.</b></p> <p><b>Evaluate the strengths and limitations of this interpretation, making reference to other interpretations that you have studied.</b></p> <p>The historical debate centres on the development of the Reformation after c.1532 and specifically the importance of Martin Luther as an individual in driving forward the German Reformation in this later phase.</p> <p>In analysing and evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the interpretation, answers might consider that Pettegree argues that Luther was not significant in the second phase of the Reformation and that other individuals were far more significant in leading the movement and driving forward the process of reform.</p> <p><b>In analysing and evaluating the strengths of the given interpretation, answers might use knowledge and</b></p>	<p>20</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No set answer is expected.</li> <li>• Candidates must use their knowledge and understanding of the historical context and the wider historical debate surrounding the issue to analyse and evaluate the given interpretation.</li> <li>• Candidates must refer to at least one other interpretation. The quality of analysis and evaluation of the interpretations should be considered when assigning answers to a level, not the quantity of other interpretations included in the answer.</li> <li>• Other interpretations considered as part of evaluation and analysis do not need to be attributed to specific named historians, but they must be recognisable historical interpretations, rather than the candidate’s own viewpoint.</li> <li>• Answers may include more on strengths or more on limitations and there is no requirement for a 50/50 split in the evaluation, however for level 5 there should be well supported evaluation of both and for level 4 supported evaluation of both, in line with levels descriptors.</li> <li>• Candidates are not required to construct their own interpretation.</li> </ul>

		<p>understanding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The importance of Melanchthon, for example preparing the Augsburg Confession.</li> <li>• Other important Protestant Church leaders such as Bucer.</li> <li>• The importance of Philip of Hesse as a political and military leader of the Protestant Reformation in this period.</li> <li>• The weakening of Luther's personal credibility, energy and influence, particularly after the scandal of Philip of Hesse's bigamy in 1541.</li> <li>• The fact that the consolidation of the Reformation continued after Luther's death in 1546.</li> <li>• The importance of the Schmalkaldic League and the willingness of the princes to lead armed resistance to Charles in enabling Lutheranism to consolidate its position in large swathes of territory, culminating in the Peace of Augsburg in 1555.</li> </ul> <p><b>In analysing and evaluating the weaknesses of the given interpretation,</b> answers might use knowledge and understanding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Luther's long-term commitment to the cause of reform up to his death.</li> <li>• The ongoing importance of his doctrinal work and ideas, and how these continued to evolve.</li> <li>• Luther's rejection of every attempt to bring him and his followers back into the Catholic fold, for example, being much firmer than Melanchthon in rejecting the possibility of compromise in 1530 and again in 1541.</li> <li>• The importance of Luther's personal sanctioning of armed resistance against the Emperor in the 1530s and 1540s.</li> <li>• The ongoing importance of Luther as a figurehead and</li> </ul>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>unifying focus in the movement, politically and religiously.</p> <p><b>Other interpretations that might be used in evaluation of the given interpretation are:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Interpretations which see Luther at the heart of the development of the Protestant Reformation right up to, his death (and with important symbolic significance beyond it).</li><li>• Interpretations which hold a balanced view of the importance of Luther in some aspects, whilst crediting other important individuals in other aspects (e.g. political versus spiritual).</li><li>• Interpretations which do not characterise the Protestant Reformation as a development which was fundamentally attributable to one man, or indeed a small number of individuals, but rather see it as cultural, political etc. (Pettegree emphasises a decline in Luther's importance as opposed to him having never been individually important).</li></ul>		
--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX 1 – this contains a generic mark scheme grid

	<i>AO1: Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.</i>
	<b>Generic mark scheme for Section A, Questions 1 and 2: Essay [30]</b>
<b>Level 5</b> 25–30 marks	There is a mostly consistent focus on the question. Generally accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding is demonstrated through most of the answer and is evaluated and analysed in order to reach substantiated judgements, but these are not consistently well-developed. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and in the most part substantiated.
<b>Level 4</b> 19–24 marks	The question is generally addressed. Generally accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and understanding is demonstrated through most of the answer with evaluation and some analysis, and this is used appropriately to support the judgements that are made. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.
<b>Level 3</b> 13–18 marks	The question is partially addressed. There is demonstration of some relevant knowledge and understanding, which is evaluated and analysed in parts of the answer, but in places knowledge is imparted rather than being used. The analysis is appropriately linked to the judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements may not always be made explicit. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.
<b>Level 2</b> 7–12 marks	The focus is more on the topic than the specific demands of the question. Knowledge and understanding is limited and not well used, with only limited evaluation and analysis, which is only sometimes linked appropriately to the judgements made. The information has some relevance, but is communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.
<b>Level 1</b> 1–6 marks	The answer relates to the topic but not the specific question. The answer contains only very limited relevant knowledge which is evaluated and analysed in a very limited way. Judgements are unsupported and are not linked to analysis. Relevant knowledge is limited, generalised and poorly used; attempts at argument are no more than assertion. Information presented is basic and may be ambiguous or unstructured. The information is supported by limited evidence.
0 marks	No evidence of understanding and no demonstration of any relevant knowledge.

	<i>A03: Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.</i>
	<b>Generic mark scheme for Section B, Question 3: Interpretation [20]</b>
<b>Level 5</b> 17–20 marks	The answer has a very good analysis of the interpretation. It uses detailed and relevant knowledge of the historical context and shows thorough understanding of the wider historical debate, in the form of detailed examination of other interpretations, in order to produce a well-supported evaluation of both the strengths and weaknesses of the given interpretation.
<b>Level 4</b> 13–16 marks	The answer has a good analysis of the interpretation. It uses relevant knowledge of the historical context and good understanding of the wider historical debate, in the form of examination of other interpretations, in order to produce a supported evaluation of both the strengths and weaknesses of the given interpretation.
<b>Level 3</b> 9–12 marks	The answer has a partial analysis of the interpretation. It uses some relevant knowledge of the historical context and shows partial understanding of the wider historical debate, in the form of reference to other interpretations, in order to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the given interpretation. The evaluation may be un-even with only limited treatment of either limitations or strengths, but both will be addressed.
<b>Level 2</b> 5–8 marks	The answer has a limited analysis of the interpretation. It uses generalised knowledge of the historical context and shows limited understanding of the wider historical debate, in the form of generalised reference to other interpretations, in order to produce a limited evaluation of the given interpretation. The evaluation may deal with either strengths or limitations in a very superficial way, or may only address limitations or strengths.
<b>Level 1</b> 1–4 marks	The answer has a very limited analysis of the interpretation which may be descriptive and relate more to the topic area than the detail of the interpretation. It uses very limited and generalised knowledge of the historical context and shows very limited or no understanding of the wider historical debate, with reference to other interpretations being implicit or lacking, in order to produce a very simplistic, asserted evaluation of the given interpretation.
0 marks	No evidence of understanding or reference to the interpretation.

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**The Triangle Building**  
**Shaftesbury Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB2 8EA**

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

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

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

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

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
is a Company Limited by Guarantee  
Registered in England  
Registered Office; The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity

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

© OCR 2019

