

# **Mark Scheme for June 2010**

---

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 2010

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)

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
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 <b>will</b> be little <b>or no</b> 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 <b>coherently, accurately and</b> 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 <b>a little</b> unevenness <b>in parts</b>.</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>

<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>• <b>Very</b> 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 <b>communication</b>.</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 <b>communication</b>.</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	A01a and b	A02a 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>
<p><b>Level 1</b></p>	<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>
<p><b>Level 2</b></p>	<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>

<p><b>Level 3</b></p>	<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><b>Reasonably coherent structure and organisation but uneven. Reasonable communication.</b></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>
<p><b>Level 4</b></p>	<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 <b>much less</b> convincing.</li> <li><b>Some relevant evidence is deployed, but evidence will</b> 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>
<p><b>Level 5</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little argument or explanation, inaccurate understanding of the issues and concepts. The answer lacks judgement.</li> <li>Limited use of relevant evidence or context which is largely inaccurate or irrelevant.</li> <li>Structure is disorganised, communication basic and the sense not always clear.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5-8</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A limited attempt to use the sources or discriminate between them. The approach is very sequential and referential, with much description. Points are undeveloped.</li> <li>There is little attempt to analyse, explain or use the sources in relation to the question. Comment may be general.</li> <li>There is a marked imbalance with no synthesis. Analysis and explanation are rare and comments are unconvincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>14-20</b></p>

<b>Level 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is very little explanation or understanding. Largely assertion, description and narrative with no judgement. Extremely limited relevance to the question.</li> <li>• Evidence is basic, generalised, patchy, inaccurate or irrelevant.</li> <li>• Little organisation or structure with poor communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3-4</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very weak and partial use of the sources for the question. No focus on interpretation.</li> <li>• A very weak, general and paraphrased use of source content.</li> <li>• No synthesis or balance. Comments are entirely unconvincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>7-13</b></p>
<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, its Origins and the Crusader States 1073-1130

### 1 The capture of Jerusalem

#### (a) Study Sources A and C

Compare these Sources as evidence for the motives driving the crusaders.

[30]

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. **A** points up some sense of religious fervour but also plundering while **C** places emphasis on divine intervention, godly zeal and inspiration. The tone and language of each can be engaged: **C** has a spiritual nature and construction, while **A**, mentioning 'rejoicing to worship', offers a more contrasting tone in the 'seizing gold and silver...'. Source **A** suggests religious zeal early on and at the end but also points up blood-lust, material booty rewards from the siege and capture; its tone and language are worthy of comment. Source **C** denies ambition, fame, repute, materialism and stresses religious inspiration at the core of crusading intentions. Comments upon authorship, tone (etc) and discrepancies will be valuable. There is evidence for economic motives, territorialism, the search for glory and ambition. The provenances may be engaged: both dated from a similar time frame; both have knowledge of the events; they diverge to some extent in their explanations. **C** is post the success of the First Crusade. The author of the Gesta in **A** was present on crusade and possibly at Jerusalem; Guibert in **C** was not. His purpose was to glorify the Crusades in the West, in effect re-writing the Gesta. His style is rhetorical – what other motive could there be? Thus he seeks to explain at a higher moral level than **A**.

Such comments on the provenances will aid evaluation. Authorship and date can be assessed. Both are written later and the dates are similar. **A** considers the immediate reasons for success while **C** offers a sense of wider perspective, written with western Christendom in mind with arguably more focus on spiritual zeal and motivation. The fact that **A** was involved in the Crusade and **C** was not can be assessed.

#### (b) Study all the Sources

Use your knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the capture of Jerusalem was the result of the military skills of the crusaders.

[70]

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 **interpretation of military strengths** is supported in Sources **A**, **D**, and part of **E**. Source **D**, from a Muslim point of view, offers a different perspective on the use of siege towers from **A** but agrees in essence on its overall account of proceedings. **An alternative view**, not least one focused on the divisions and disunity of the Muslim opponents, can be found in Source **D** and some of **E**. Topic knowledge can support the view of the Muslims as divided and disunited (eg the antipathy towards Kerbuqa in 1098) and **E** suggests a possible dilatory approach by the Egyptian army failing to aid Jerusalem. But much can be made of crusader leadership, strategy and tactics, religious zeal and adaptability to climate and conditions. **E** offers valuable comments about the 'fanatically brave and confident' army deployed at Jerusalem; it also points up the extreme conditions faced by the besiegers. Sources **A** and **D** focus upon military tactics and the methods in defeating opponents. Sources **B** and **C** emphasise religious enthusiasm, the great 'deeds of the Franks', 'miracles', the sense of God's favour.

Guibert doesn't refer to miracles but Fulcher does. Fulcher was not present at the siege, arriving later, but wrote to encourage emigration to the Holy Land stressing it to be a mystical and miraculous place. Knowledge could provide examples of this, eg the apparent appearance of Adhemar of Puy. As such, these are a representative expression of some of the main reasons. Notice can be given to tone and content of language and to provenances. Overall evaluation should embrace such. Candidates should put the siege and capture into its context, including the events of 1098 and 1099, and are likely to consider such issues and themes as the importance of the capture of Antioch (cf Source **D**), the internal problems facing the Crusader army, the leadership of the nobles, the use of tactics (including the cavalry), luck, the nature of Muslim divisions (seen at Antioch and prior to Jerusalem). They may consider that, given their internal problems and the lack of effective support from the Byzantine Emperor, the Crusaders' success was very much theirs. Then again, they may feel that the seriousness of Muslim splits and disunity (e.g. between Shi'ites and Sunnites, Turks and Egyptians, Aleppo and Damascus) were crucial factors and can be linked to **D**, some of **E** (the provenance of **D** may be commented upon). **A**, **B** and **C**, some of **E** place emphasis on crusader virtues, inspiration, fortitude and motivational strengths. The language of the first three, especially **B** and **C**, may prove useful to evaluation. Candidates may view crusader strengths, not least spiritual and religious, as crucial. Then again, they may feel that the weaknesses of their opponents gave them useful advantages at times. Some comparison of Crusader and Muslim religious zeal, leadership, strategy and tactics, morale, for instance, could prove effective here.

**The German Reformation 1517-1555****2 Luther's beliefs and their impact 1520-25****(a) Study Sources A and D**

**Compare these Sources as evidence for Luther's teachings on how Christians should conduct themselves. [30]**

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 author of both Sources is the same; however, the **provenance** is different. The audience of Source **A** is the German nation whereas the audience of Source **D** is directly John the Steadfast of Saxony, heir to Frederick the Wise but more generally 'the German princes' temporal authority'. Therefore Source **A** sets out general Christian theology while Source **D** refers to political power and princely duties in the context of Christian theology. Purpose and context are important factors in using provenance. Luther in Source **A** is laying down his religious beliefs to challenge the Catholic authorities and rally support before his final excommunication as a heretic. In Source **D**, he is advising the heir of his patron, Frederick the Wise, on how to defend himself from the ensuing enemies. This might be from Catholic enemies Electoral Saxony has made due to support for the excommunicated Luther, or perhaps Luther's Knightly supporters who are starting a war at this time.

The Sources are **similar**. In Source **A**, 'freedom' is of the Christian spirit which comes from faith in the Gospel alone; 'scripture alone' and 'justification by faith alone'. Faith frees a Christian from having to perform good works, as the Roman Catholic Church had taught. In Source **D** this translates as a justification of war as long as it is 'done in love' for the protection of a prince's subjects. Similarly Source **A** suggests a Christian is spiritually free as he will naturally act in a good way, being he is a good man. Similarly in Source **D**, if the prince is not in the right, then he is not a good Christian, so his people have no duty to follow him 'for one must obey God more than men'. In Source **A** this is expressed as 'justification by faith alone'. The Christian in Source **A** is a servant of all, and the Christian prince in Source **D** has a duty to his subjects and to offer justice and peace rather than war.

The Sources also **differ**. Whereas Source **A** sets out Luther's belief in scriptural equality, with all Christian men being 'kings' and 'priests', Source **D** refers to 'inferiors' and 'foreigners' as other categories of people besides 'equals'. This is ambiguous, but may be inferred to mean non-Christians. However, in the context of 1523, it is more likely to imply social inferiors, such as knights and peasants. In Source **A** Luther suggests Christians should act for the general good of others, whereas in Source **D** he suggests a just war may be fought 'force with force' to protect self-interest, and the deaths of the enemy may be justified out of love and protection for a prince's own subjects. The duty of a subject is to obey their prince if he is a good Christian, and lay down their lives for others, but to obey God first. Generally, in Source **A** more emphasis is placed on freedom than on duty and power which is stressed in Source **D**.

Brief comments on **context** must be credited only in so far as they aid the comparison. The excommunication of Luther, the old age of Frederick the Wise, the weakness of the Emperor in enforcing the Edict of Worms and the Knights' and imminent Peasants' Wars explain the differences in emphasis of the two Sources. Other key factors are Luther's purpose and audience. Source **A** is more typical of Luther's beliefs, as he is primarily a theologian rather than a politician. 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 Luther's beliefs were revolutionary.**

**[70]**

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 appears predominantly in Sources **A**, **B** and **E**, though **A** refers to a revolution in religious beliefs whereas **B** refers to political or social revolution and **E** to both. Sources **A** and **E** refer to the nature of the beliefs themselves as being revolutionary, while **B** and **E** refer to their revolutionary impact. The **opposing** view features in Sources **C** and **D**, which dwell particularly on the importance of duty and obedience, and justify actions traditionally accepted, for example all princes felt justified in waging war for defence.

The **supporting** view might cross-reference the theological beliefs in Source **A** with the social interpretation given to Luther's beliefs in Source **E**. 'Thus the Bible agrees that we ought to be free' in the Peasants grievances is their understanding of 'A Christian man is the most free lord of all, and subject to none' meant spiritually in Source **A**. A spiritual revolution is transformed into a social revolution. 'Christ has delivered and redeemed all of us, without exception, by His blood shed for the great and lowly equally', a traditional Christian belief in Source **A** is transformed into a social manifesto in Source **D**. These views inspire political revolution in Source **B**, by von Hutten and the Imperial Knights: 'Let us liberate the oppressed fatherland'. Knowledge might supply the social context for these misinterpretations; the political landscape of the Holy Roman Empire, social decline of the imperial Knights and serfdom of the peasants in some areas. The landlords in some parts of the Empire were Churchmen or monasteries, which adds extra heat to the grievances. This might explain 'they' in von Hutten's comment in Source **B** 'they have condemned innocent blood, but God will destroy them in their malice' in context of the excommunication of Luther and himself. Von Hutten's earlier support for Luther might be used in evaluating the provenance of Source **B**, and using 'force with force' features in both Sources **B** and **D**. The tone of **B** and **D** is more extreme than the other Sources. The tone of Source **A** is religious.

The Sources also support the **opposing** view. Sources **C**, **D** and **E** firmly back the power of the princes and their subjects' duty of obedience to them. 'You must render obedience to the powers that be, and sustain the powers of His Imperial Majesty' are very conservative ideas. This is despite the context of Charles' Edict of Worms banning Luther from the Empire. Comments on context and provenance might suggest that Luther needed support from John the Steadfast in the light of Frederick's old age (he died in 1525) and Luther's ban. Luther was also losing control of the German Reformation to the extremists, as shown by Sources **B** and **E**, so for his own protection he needed princely support. This might be linked to the content of Source **D**, where Luther's view is that the main duty of the prince is to protect his subjects, who together they should lay down their lives for the good of others. Luther sees his cause as God's cause, and 'one must obey God more than men.'

The **provenance** of the Sources should be integrated into the discussion. The authorship, context, tone and purpose of the Sources are revealing, as shown above. In Source **E** Philip Melanchthon, a moderate supporter of Luther, had considerable influence and wished to distance Luther's teaching from association with the Peasants' War by rational argument, unlike Luther's angry pamphlet 'Against the Murdering Hordes of Peasants.' Melanchthon was one of a group of moderate Lutherans who publicly denounced the peasants' interpretation of Luther's teachings and emphasised their politically conservative nature. Von Hutten in Source **B** represents the extremist view in the absence of a Source written by Thomas Müntzer, who had stirred the peasants to misinterpret Luther's teachings.

Supported overall **judgement** should be reached on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation that Luther's beliefs were revolutionary. No specific judgement is expected.

Candidates are likely to consider a range of ideas within the Sources: the nature of Luther's beliefs, perhaps conservative theologically, spiritually and socially revolutionary, and with a revolutionary political impact. They are likely to set the Sources within the context of Luther's condemnation for heresy, need for princely support and the outbreak of the Knights' and Peasants' Wars. It is up to candidates to assess and decide upon relative importance here, there being no set conclusion.

**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 2010