

**GCE**

**History A**

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

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

**Mark Scheme for June 2014**

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 will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2014

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

Annotation	Meaning
<b>BP</b>	<b>Blank Page</b> – this annotation must be used on all blank pages within an answer booklet (structured or unstructured) and on each page of an additional object where there is no candidate response.
<b>C</b>	In <b>Q(a)</b> a comparison of source similarity or difference is made, either of content or of provenance .In <b>Q(b)</b> it denotes an effective grouping (for two or more interpretations), linkage or cross reference between sources.
<b>J</b>	In <b>Q(a)</b> a judgement is reached on the sources as <i>evidence</i> using content and provenance. In <b>Q(b)</b> a judgement is made on how far the <i>sources</i> support an interpretation.
<b>P</b>	In <b>Q(a)</b> the provenance is discussed and used as part of the judgement. In <b>Q(b)</b> a source’s provenance is discussed discretely and not used to evaluate for the question. Linkage to the question is implicit.
<b>S</b>	In <b>Q(a)</b> a source or both sources are discussed separately and sequentially thus preventing comparison. In <b>Q(b)</b> the sources are approached sequentially thus preventing linkage and cross reference for the argument.
<b>XP</b>	Points of content and argument are juxtaposed – they are not comparable in <b>Q(a)</b> or the linkage made is inappropriate in <b>Q(b)</b> .
<b>F</b>	In either question the approach to a source, the sources as a whole, or the response in general, is overly formulaic or generic, failing to engage with either source content or precise provenance and context .
<b>KU</b>	Knowledge is used appropriately to support, extend, explain (context) or question a source or sources.
<b>K</b>	Knowledge is ‘bolt-on’, there for its own sake and not used or linked to the sources.
<b>EVAL</b>	There is evaluation of the sources for the key issue and question. This can be used for <b>Q(a)</b> but is more likely to be used for <b>Q(b)</b> .
<b>ILL</b>	The sources are simply used for reference or to illustrate an argument in <b>Q(b)</b> .
<b>NAQ</b>	The points made are not linked to the question and do not answer it.
<b>?</b>	This is to be used in <b>both</b> questions where is a factual error, irrelevant material and, in <b>Q(b)</b> , an inaccurate, questionable or unconvincing grouping of the sources for the question. It is also to be used in both questions where a judgement is on the topic rather than the sources.
<b>NAR</b>	There is description, either of the sources or of knowledge, or simply a narrative.
<b>SEEN</b>	The page has been read. This <b>must be used on each page seen</b> to ensure that the whole response has been considered.

**NB.** A brief summative comment is required following both questions. Use the language of the generic mark scheme to justify the level you have awarded. For specific guidance please refer to the topic specific mark scheme. Marks awarded must match the comments given.

**Subject-specific Marking Instructions.**

**Question (a) Maximum mark 30**

**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 will be little or no unevenness.</li> <li>• Focused use of a range of relevant historical concepts and context to address the key issue.</li> <li>• The answer is clearly structured and organised. Communicates coherently, accurately and effectively.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13-14</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focused comparative analysis. Controlled and discriminating evaluation of content and provenance, whether integrated or treated separately.</li> <li>• Evaluates using a range of relevant provenance points in relation to the sources and question. There is a thorough but not necessarily exhaustive exploration of these.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>15-16</b></p>
<b>Level 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Largely comparative evaluation of the key issue with a balanced and supported judgement. There may be a little unevenness in parts.</li> <li>• Focused use of some relevant historical context with a good conceptual understanding to address the key issue.</li> <li>• The answer is well structured and organised. Communicates clearly.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>11-12</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant comparative analysis of content and evaluation of provenance but there may be some unevenness in coverage or control.</li> <li>• Source evaluation is reasonably full and appropriate but lacks completeness on the issues raised by the sources in the light of the question.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13-14</b></p>

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

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

**Question (b) Maximum mark 70**

**Notes related to Part B:**

- (iv) Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO
- (v) If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found
- (vi) Many answers will not be at the same level for each AO

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
Total mark for the question = 70	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context;</li> <li>- the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied.</li> </ul>	<p>As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.</p> <p>Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.</p>
<b>Level 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convincing analysis and argument with developed explanation leading to careful, supported and persuasive judgement arising from a consideration of both content and provenance. There may be a little unevenness at the bottom of the level.</li> <li>• Sharply focused use and control of a range of reliable evidence to confirm, qualify, extend or question the sources.</li> <li>• Coherent organised structure. Accurate and effective communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>20-22</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A carefully grouped and comparative evaluation of <b>all</b> the sources with effective levels of discrimination sharply focused on the interpretation.</li> <li>• Analyses and evaluates the strengths, limitations and utility of the sources in relation to the interpretation. Uses and cross references points in individual or grouped sources to support or refute an interpretation.</li> <li>• Integrates sources with contextual knowledge in analysis and evaluation and is convincing in most respects. Has synthesis within the argument through most of the answer.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>42-48</b></p>
<b>Level 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good attempt at focused analysis, argument and explanation leading to a supported judgement that is based on the use of most of the content and provenance.</li> <li>• A focused use of relevant evidence to put the sources into context.</li> <li>• Mostly coherent structure and organisation if uneven in parts. Good communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>17-19</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grouped analysis and use of <b>most</b> of the sources with good levels of discrimination and a reasonable focus on the interpretation.</li> <li>• Analyses and evaluates some of the strengths and limitations of the sources in relation to the interpretation. May focus more on individual sources within a grouping, so cross referencing may be less frequent.</li> <li>• Some, perhaps less balanced, integration of sources and contextual knowledge to analyse and evaluate the interpretation. Synthesis of the skills may be less developed. The analysis and evaluation is reasonably convincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>35-41</b></p>

<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>Reasonably coherent structure and organisation but uneven. Reasonable communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13-16</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some grouping although not sustained or developed. Sources are mainly approached discretely with limited cross reference. Their use is less developed and may, in parts, lose focus on the interpretation. There may be some description of content and provenance.</li> <li>Is aware of some of the limitations of the sources, individually or as a group, but mostly uses them for reference and to illustrate an argument rather than analysing and evaluating them as evidence. There is little cross referencing.</li> <li>There may be unevenness in using knowledge in relation to the sources. Synthesis may be patchy or bolted on. Analysis and evaluation are only partially convincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>28-34</b></p>
<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 much less convincing.</li> <li>Some relevant evidence is deployed, but evidence will vary in accuracy, relevance and extent. It may be generalised or tangential.</li> <li>Structure is less organised, communication less clear and some inaccuracies of expression.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>9-12</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sources are discussed discretely and largely sequentially, perhaps within very basic groups. Loses focus on the interpretation. The sources are frequently described.</li> <li>May mention some limitations of individual sources but largely uses them for reference and illustration. Cross referencing is unlikely.</li> <li>An imbalance and lack of integration between sources and knowledge often with discrete sections. There is little synthesis. Analysis and explanation may be muddled and unconvincing in part.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>21-27</b></p>
<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>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (a)	<p><b>The context</b> is the problem Alexius faced from the crusading ‘help’ in the form of their armies en-route for the Holy Land – Source D’s ‘countless Frankish armies approaching’ a weakened Empire. Did his reaction reflect an honourable character or a duplicitous one? The Sources are <b>similar</b> in content in that they agree the Frankish armies are problematic. Both accounts indicate that Alexius was capable of some duplicity, very overtly according to <b>Source C</b> (‘famed for it’) and less obviously in <b>Source D</b>. In the latter although he supplied the knights well he also kept a close eye on them in case of misbehaviour. Anna in <b>D</b> sees this as less duplicitous in character than a careful and prudent diplomatic nature in a fraught situation. Thus both sources consider his character to be that of a diplomat, although <b>D</b> sees this positively, <b>C</b> negatively.</p> <p>The Sources <b>differ</b> in content in that <b>Source C</b> has no good character at all to credit to Alexius. He is seen as a cunning and devious diplomat who used strategies to cover military weakness. He was short-tempered, failed to rescue an ally from an ambush and resorted to poison to reduce the army of a leader who was supposedly on the same side as he was. His one concern was to gain homage and subservience, using the Crusaders’ army as vassals to recapture lost Byzantine territory neutering any army that was too large to control. In contrast Source <b>D</b> is a defence of Alexius who is depicted as doing the best he could for his empire in difficult circumstances. Although seeing the potential of the Franks as allies he also sees them as a potential threat needing careful and tactful control if he and the Byzantines were to survive. He could not resist a large host successfully. Moving them on rapidly was the best move. They also differ over Behemond. <b>Source C</b> sees the unfortunate Behemond as the particular victim of Alexius’ ‘snares’, whilst <b>Anna in D</b> makes no mention of him, simply smearing all crusaders as greedy and duplicitous, as they do Alexius. Context might suggest that Behemond was not lacking in the devious stakes himself and is certainly not the innocent portrayed here by <b>C</b>.</p> <p>The <b>provenance</b> and <b>context</b> of the Sources should be used to evaluate these similarities and differences. William of Malmesbury was an English monk, writing very much from information received based on hearsay, such as the account of Alexius poisoning rivers. He never visited Byzantium or the East and clearly had little sympathy for Eastern Christianity and none at all for Alexius. He</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources</u></p> <p>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>A supported judgement should be reached on their relative value as evidence. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgements should be reached for the top levels of the mark scheme.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>demonstrates through his tone what rapidly became the perceived wisdom in the West on Alexius – that of a tricky and devious Eastern Emperor. His hostility makes him an unreliable source. In terms of <b>judgement</b> candidates are likely to consider <b>Anna in D</b> the better source for information on Alexius' character but she also is not free from bias being devoted to her father and portraying him in the best possible light as a pragmatic ruler. However she was certainly closer to events, had access to Byzantine sources and the leisure to use them fully and is likely to be preferred as a judge of character. For example Alexius had previous experience of Behemond's ambitions in the Byzantine Empire and the East but Anna only hints here ('agreements broken') at Alexius' hope that he could retain reconquered land through crusader homage, hence perhaps his anger at William of Poitou catalogued in <b>C</b> over this issue. Both sources provide only hints at the subtext here, although they again agree that Alexius is an accomplished diplomat whether they approve or not.</p>		
(b)	<p>The Sources contain references to different interpretations so they may be grouped according to their view. The <b>supporting</b> view that the relationship was a hostile one is partially found in <b>B</b>, Peter the Hermit's crusade, and to an extent in <b>D</b>, Anna Comnena, but particularly in <b>C</b>, William of Malmesbury. The <b>alternative view</b>, that relations were more congenial, comes out in <b>Source A</b> from the Pope, parts of <b>Source B</b> and <b>Source D</b>, Anna Comnena, and in <b>E</b>, the modern historian who comments on the situation before and during 1095.</p> <p>The <b>supporting</b> argument in <b>Source B</b> is that the Emperor was not impressed by the behaviour of Peter's horde and so moved them on rapidly, leading to their defeat. Anna in <b>Source D</b> is aware that her father was not happy at the arrival of a large Frankish army and comments very negatively upon the greed of the crusaders. Alexius kept a wary eye on them. <b>Source C</b> considers the relationship to be entirely hostile because of the duplicitous nature of Alexius in his relations with well-meaning crusader leaders, notably Bohemond and William of Poitou. Own knowledge might challenge this view. Much of this hostility came down to a feeling by the Franks that the crusaders were being used to regain lost Byzantine territory together with a certain religious and a personal stereotyping by both sides.</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, and limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing on the terms of the question, but no set conclusion is expected.</p> <p>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.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>The <b>opposing</b> argument is found in <b>Source A</b> where the Pope was willing and eager to send help to Alexius, supporting the points made in <b>Source E</b>. Both are dealing with the initial stages of the Crusade and the events running up to its calling. <b>Source B</b> shows that Alexius gave the People’s Crusade sound advice and yet they provoked his anger inexcusably through theft and misplaced zeal and then suffered from the terrain and the heat, hardly his fault. In <b>Source D</b>, similarly, Alexius was considered by his daughter Anna to be right to be worried. If his surmises about the crusaders were true, then, again, the crusaders were the authors of their own difficulties. According to <b>Anna in D</b> he was courteous and cordial. Despite his worries they were ‘received kindly’ and ‘supported abundantly’, in direct opposition to the allegations made by <b>William of Malmesbury in C</b> (‘snares’, ‘poisoning of rivers’ etc.). Comparison with <b>Source B</b> might suggest Alexius was justified in his views on plunder and theft. <b>Source E</b> suggests Alexius was ready for a friendly relationship up to 1095 and indeed had cultivated one, but the sheer numbers of the crusaders would have alarmed him, as <b>Source D</b> indicates. He had ‘sought to sooth tensions’, encouraging religious compromise between Eastern and Western Christianity. <b>Asbridge in E</b> points out that much of Alexius’ army were in fact western mercenaries and this is probably what he envisaged when appealing to the West for help in 1095. Until then the military relationship between East and West had worked along these lines.</p> <p>Regarding the <b>provenance</b> and <b>context</b> three of the sources are Western but balance each other. Two give some evidence of initial respect and concern and might therefore be given some credence. Only <b>William of Malmesbury in C</b> is entirely hostile and he writes later and from the relative backwater of English monasticism. <b>The Pope in A</b> takes up a predictable position. When Michael VII had begged Gregory for help in 1073, the Pope responded with wild schemes for an army of liberation. His ‘Call for Assistance’ in <b>A</b> is characterised by a demonization of the Turks but also unstinting respect for the Eastern Churches and Empire – ‘the great Greek Empire’. However this could just be propaganda and not based on the reality of East/West relations in the 1070s. <b>Source B</b> is written in a relatively impartial way for a Frankish source and has the merit of going on the crusade. It recognises that the Christians behaved badly and were in part responsible for their own fate. The Emperor was prepared to be co-</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>operative and it might be considered effective evidence that the initial relationship was warily good, degenerating only when faced with each other in practice. <b>William of Malmesbury in C</b> was a careful researcher, but from his English monastery is unlikely to have accurate information or at least would be affected by the pro Frankish gloss attached to the sources he was using. However, he backs his views with specific instances, some of dubious authenticity, and there were issues between Alexius and Bohemond in particular, although William of Malmesbury only gives one side of this. Clearly some of his evidence is dubious ('poisoned rivers'), others based more on real hostilities and differences (the issues of homage connected to William of Poitou and Bohemond). <b>Source D</b> is also far from impartial and Anna is sure her father made the right decision from prudence and it was reasonable for him to take precautions against a possible provoking of discontent and unrest in his empire. Her account is reasonably reliable and is the only one of the set from a Byzantine perspective. <b>Source E</b> illustrates that Alexius had been on good terms with some crusaders and his appeal at Piacenza was heard without hostility, even if the first to arrive was the disorderly rabble led by Peter.</p> <p>Candidates may well conclude that, while Byzantium and the western crusaders were, in theory, on the same side, there were plenty of issues which arose to cause hostility, chiefly Alexius' fear that they were so powerful they could possibly overthrow him or at least carve out Frankish kingdoms from former Byzantine territory and the Frankish suspicion they were being used. An evaluation of the sources may well conclude that the western provenance of <b>A and B</b> match that of the Byzantine Anna in <b>D</b> and the modern historian in <b>E</b>. They stress earlier cordiality in relations but, from the arrival of Peter the Hermit and then the main Frankish armies, hostility grew, attested to by both sides – <b>B, C and D</b>. <b>Source A</b> may be discounted as propaganda with its wider agenda of raising an army to throw back the Turks, as can much of what <b>William of Malmesbury says in C</b> but <b>The Gesta in B, Anna in D and Asbridge in E</b> give more telling accounts from a variety of perspectives. Their conclusion is of initial cordiality followed by growing suspicion and hostility.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (a)	<p>The Sources are <b>similar</b> in content. Both Sources are written by Pope Leo X though their context is 2 years apart. <b>Source B</b> refers to Luther as a ‘good for nothing Augustinian’ forgetting his duty of obedience to the Roman Church and <b>Source E</b> to Luther disobeying the Pope’s order to come to Rome. <b>Knowledge</b> of Luther’s status as a Doctor of Theology at Wittenberg might be used to qualify <b>Source B</b> and the 95 Theses compared to the vast range of his publications including his three major pamphlets by the time of <b>Source E</b> in 1520. <b>Source B</b> refers to the Pope attempting to correct Luther paternally whilst <b>Source E</b> also refers to Leo X showing ‘fatherly love’ and dealing graciously with Luther at the start of the dispute. <b>Knowledge</b> of correspondence between Luther and the Pope might be used to evaluate their early relationship compared to the rather abusive exchanges between Luther and Prierias and Luther and Eck. <b>Source B</b> suggests that Luther added to his heresies instead of returning to obedience to the Church and <b>Source E</b> refers to Leo again reminding him patiently, in writing, to end his errors. Knowledge might be used to evaluate the likely consequences of Luther going to Rome in the light of Leo’s determination to treat him as a heretic, i.e. by burning him, despite Luther’s support from Frederick of Saxony and the wider German populace by 1520. <b>Source E</b> asserts that the Pope reprimanded Luther through messengers while <b>Source B</b> is a set of instructions to one of these messengers, Cajetan. In neither Source is there any hint that Leo X was prepared to compromise or see Luther’s point of view – he merely states in <b>Source E</b> that he wished to prove him wrong when criticising papal law. <b>Knowledge</b> of the indulgences controversy might be introduced to develop this point. In both Sources, Leo X’s intentions are to compel Luther to repent or publicly declare him a heretic.</p> <p>The Sources are also <b>different</b>. In <b>Source B</b> Luther is ‘a certain Martin Luther, good-for-nothing Augustinian’ and ‘pest’. Context might be used to explain that this might be because in the autumn of 1518 Luther’s fame has not fully spread, even though Leo calls the affair ‘notorious’. By the time of <b>Source E</b>, June 1520, Luther’s popularity and support might explain Leo’s different tone in blaming ‘evil men’ on whose false rumours Luther based his unfounded criticisms of Rome. <b>Source E</b> differs from <b>Source B</b> in attitude as Leo X tries to defend and justify the laws made by his papal predecessors who never made errors. There is no hint of this in <b>B</b>. However, his uncompromising attitude remains the same.</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</u></p> <p>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>The sources can be read/analysed in different ways and as part of their judgement candidates will need to appreciate this.</p> <p>A supported judgement should be reached on the relative value of the sources as evidence, taking into consideration provenance and content in context. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Source B's</b> angry and emotive, more spontaneous language in the private letter to Cajetan is very <b>different</b> from <b>Source E</b> where the official tone is more measured and persuasive to appear reasonable and regretful. This was to retain the support of those who had not taken Luther's side and attract back those who may have done so. It is the language of a Papal Bull concerned to show that Leo over three years had tried to persuade Luther of his errors. Although there is a stronger emphasis on persuasion and patience in <b>Source E</b> as the context for excommunication compared to private condemnation in <b>Source B</b>, the particular extract is untypical of the rest of the Bull of excommunication, which in other sections refers to Luther as a 'scabby sheep infecting the flock' in a similar tone to 'infecting the minds of simple folk' in <b>Source B</b>. It might be inferred that Leo was patient in waiting for 2 years before carrying out in Source E the threat of excommunication he had stated would be the result of intransigence in <b>Source B</b>.</p> <p><b>In judgement</b> both sources may be seen as useful in demonstrating different types of negotiated approaches to Luther at different stages of their dispute, although candidates may see <b>B</b> as the more truthful and revealing as to Leo's attitude given its purpose and private nature. Source E was the official condemnation and the extract is part of the justification for excommunication (Leo, 'Dear God..had tried').</p>		
(b)	<p>The Sources contain references to both sides of the argument, so they may be grouped according to their view. <b>Sources A, C</b>, and to an extent the content of <b>B</b> and <b>E</b>, are useful for the <b>supporting</b> view that both Luther and the Pope wished to settle their dispute peacefully. <b>Sources B, D</b> and the nature and purpose of <b>E</b> are useful for the <b>opposing</b> view, that the dispute was too bitter to be settled peacefully.</p> <p><b>Sources A, C</b> and <b>E</b> are useful for the <b>supporting</b> view and might be linked to <b>Source B</b>. <b>Sources A</b> and <b>C</b> suggest that Luther wished to settle his dispute with Rome peacefully. Both are written by Luther himself during 1518 in the early stages of his challenge to the Church. In <b>Source A</b>, Luther says that he did not intend the 95 Theses to be widely published for all to read, but that they were intended merely for academic discussion. He claims uncertainty on some points and expresses concern at the fuss. In <b>Source C</b> he likewise submits 'to the</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>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 it is not necessary to explore all angles within the Sources even for the top Level of</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>judgement of the Church and those better informed'. In <b>Source A</b> he covers himself from attack by stating that he is still unsure of some points, would have expanded or omitted others if he had realised they would be read so widely. Likewise, in <b>Source C</b> he admits that he can be wrong. In <b>Source A</b>, Luther states that he regrets writing the 95 Theses because this way of instructing people is unwise. Similarly, in <b>Source C</b>, in his debate with Cajetan, Luther reports that he had declared himself willing to withdraw any of his words or actions which ran counter to 'cherishing and following of the Catholic Church'. However, in evaluation of the content of <b>C</b>, Luther stands by his statement that he 'denied the Pope superior to the council and scripture', although it might be seen to contradict the existing structure of the Church he claimed to cherish. Therefore he is asserting a humility which is not fully convincing in the light of <b>knowledge</b> of his outbursts and anger against Tetzal and Prierias, referred to in <b>Source B</b> as his 'slanders' and 'rashness'.</p> <p>The <b>provenances</b> of <b>Source A</b> and <b>C</b> are valuable for evaluation of the interpretation and might be cross-referenced with <b>Source B</b> for evaluation. In both cases, Luther's purpose is to justify his actions. In <b>Source A</b> he is writing a private letter to a sympathetic publisher of his works distancing himself from the publicity – the 'notorious affair' referred to in <b>Source B</b> - and hedging his bets at a time when he is unsure of any influential support. On 5 March he has yet to be brought before the Augustinian chapter in the disputation at Heidelberg. The fact that Leo X calls him a 'good-for-nothing Augustinian' in <b>Source B</b> confirms some support from his order, yet he had yet to be sure of Frederick of Saxony's favour. However, the context of <b>Source C</b> is Luther's debate with Cardinal Cajetan, a major turning point in events, as he was at that stage in danger of failing to gain support from friends and from Frederick of Saxony if he performed badly, although as an Imperial city Augsburg was more 'neutral' a venue than elsewhere. Therefore, in <b>Source C</b> Luther himself is making use of the printing press to publish his own version of what he had said with the purpose of gaining support. Thus the reliability of <b>Sources A</b> and <b>C</b>, on the question of a peaceful settlement with Luther perhaps 'pretending' concern over publicity in <b>A</b> and using it in <b>C</b>, might be brought into question.</p> <p><b>Source E</b> and, to a lesser extent, <b>Sources B</b> and <b>C</b> suggest that the Pope</p>		<p>the mark scheme, and no set conclusion is expected.</p> <p>Overall, in evaluation of the interpretation, it might be concluded that both sides held their ground and there was never the possibility of a peaceful settlement while Luther challenged papal power. Both groups of Sources have limitations of reliability and use in their relative value as evidence. Supported overall <b>judgement</b> should be reached on <b>how far the Sources accept the interpretation</b>. No specific judgement is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>wished to end the dispute with Luther peacefully. In <b>Source B</b>, Leo X instructs Cajetan ‘if he repents, receive him into the Church’, showing the aim to end the dispute with forgiveness, and similarly in <b>Source C</b> Luther reports that ‘Cajetan said he did not wish to argue but to settle the matter peacefully in a fatherly fashion’. <b>Knowledge</b> of the exchanges during their debate at Augsburg might be added to extend the source. <b>Source E</b> also emphasises the Pope’s ‘patience’, ‘fatherly love’ and ‘gracious dealings’ with Luther. This propaganda, in part of a bull condemning Luther for heresy and excommunicating him, as he had suggested earlier in <b>Source B</b> extends to ‘a safe conduct’ to Rome. <b>Knowledge</b> of Jan Huss’s burning for heresy at the Council of Constance in 1415 might be cited in evaluation of the reliability of this offer. Leo’s claims he wished to persuade Luther not to accept ‘evil rumours’ by proving that Church law was correct. He shifts all the blame for the dispute onto Luther’s stubbornness and errors. Therefore, it might be suggested that Leo’s view is unconvincing, as, like Luther, he would not compromise, and that was the only way to reach a peaceful settlement of their dispute.</p> <p><b>Sources B, D</b> and the nature and purpose of <b>E</b> are useful for the <b>opposing</b> view, that the dispute was too bitter to be settled peacefully. <b>Sources B</b>, Leo X, and <b>D</b>, Eck, have a bitter tone towards Luther which is far from peaceful. <b>Source B</b> calls him ‘good-for-nothing’, ‘rash’, ‘obstinate’, a ‘pest’ and a ‘heretic’. It seems that he has already been condemned unheard unless he recants. <b>Knowledge</b> of his early clashes with representatives of the Catholic Church – e.g. Tetzl and Prierias, might be used to extend this point. Likewise, Eck, in <b>Source D</b>, calls Luther ‘bold’, ‘blind in his wickedness’, discredited even among common people’. This final phrase is likely to be evaluated as Catholic propaganda in the light of <b>knowledge</b> of the widespread support for Luther’s ideas in Germany by 1519. Unlike Luther’s statement of love for the Church in <b>Source C</b>, perhaps itself propaganda, Eck in <b>D</b> claims that Luther ‘rejected Church authorities from the earliest times without a blush’ and teaches disobedience to Church law, similarly to <b>Source E</b>. Eck’s claim that Luther ‘declared that he would stand alone against a thousand authorities’ contradicts the claims of Luther in <b>Source C</b> at Augsburg. <b>Knowledge</b> of exchanges during the debate at Leipzig might be used to evaluate source reliability. The nature and purpose of <b>Source E</b>, a papal bull declaring Luther a heretic and excommunicating him is far from a peaceful</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>attempt to end the dispute with him, regardless of Leo X's rhetoric within this extract. Likewise, <b>knowledge</b> of Luther's burning of the bull might be used to evaluate how peaceful their relationship was at this time.</p> <p><b>Judgement</b> could be either way. The provenance of the sources suggests a certain amount of jockeying for position and careful points of propaganda in public sources (<b>Luther in A and C; Eck in D</b> and the <b>Pope in E</b>). Some may see <b>B</b> as the most reliable for the question– Leo's private instructions to Cajetan – which reveal a lack of compromise from the Church, a concern to settle quickly (and hopefully peacefully) yet firmly in favour of the Church. Thus some may conclude that the provenance of the sources suggests a public desire to settle peacefully by both sides, but in private, and reading between the lines, a battle of words and a lack of much desire to compromise.</p>		

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

**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; 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 2014

