



AS HISTORY 7041/1A

The Age of the Crusades, c1071–1204

Component 1A The Crusader states and Outremer, c1071–1149

Mark scheme

June 2019

Version: 1.0 Final

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

System Name	Description
?	Questionable or unclear comment or fact
^	Omission – of evidence or comment
Cross	Inaccurate fact
H Line	Incorrect or dubious comment or information
IR	Irrelevant material
SEEN_BIG	Use to mark blank pages or plans
Tick	Creditworthy comment or fact
On page comment	Use text box if necessary to exemplify other annotations and add further comment. Always provide a text box comment at the end of each answer.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

The Age of the Crusades, c1071–1204

Component 1A The Crusader states and Outremer, c1071–1149

Section A

- 01** With reference to these extracts and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two extracts provides the more convincing interpretation of the situation in Byzantium in the reign of Alexius Comnenus before the First Crusade? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO3

Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. They will evaluate the extracts thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated judgement on which offers the more convincing interpretation. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion as to which offers the more convincing interpretation. However, not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements may be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show a reasonable understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. Comments as to which offers the more convincing interpretation will be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will show some partial understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be some undeveloped comment in relation to the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6-10**
- L1:** The answer will show a little understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be only unsupported, vague or generalist comment in relation to the question. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

In responding to this question, students may choose to respond to each extract in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach to individual arguments. Either approach could be equally valid, and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

Students must assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate or challenge.

Extract A: In their identification of Frankopan's argument, students may refer to the following:

- for most of Alexius' reign he did not face a serious threat from the Turks in Asia Minor
- Manzikert was not a serious watershed moment which irreparably damaged the Byzantine Empire
- the situation with regards to the Seljuk Turks worsened in the 1090s.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- Alexius spent much of the first decade of his reign fighting the Normans and Pechenegs – that the Turks were less of a threat is evidenced by his lack of activity or apparent concern in this area
- Alexius made an alliance with Malik Shah which helped to prevent further Turkish encroachments into Byzantine territory and Alexius often used Turkish troops in his army
- to criticise the view, they might consider the threat posed by the Turkish capital at Nicaea (worryingly close to Constantinople) or the loss of Antioch in 1084. The Turkish presence in Asia Minor meant that Alexius struggled to recruit men for his army and to collect enough taxes.

Extract B: In their identification of Norwich's argument, students may refer to the following:

- the Byzantines were in a very weak position in the 1080s – facing threats from both the Normans and the Pechenegs
- the Byzantines were lucky that Robert Guiscard died when he did, allowing a temporary respite from the Norman threat
- Alexius decisively defeated the Pechenegs in 1091 which meant that he could look to strengthen his position, but he had to rely on help from mercenaries to do this.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- the Normans posed an enormous threat to Byzantium. Guiscard had captured Italian territories before Alexius came to the throne and then decisively defeated him at Durazzo in 1081 – leading to the loss of key territories by 1082. Alexius had managed to temporarily end this threat only by concluding an expensive alliance with Emperor Henry IV of the Holy Roman Empire
- the timing of Guiscard's death allowed Alexius to focus on other problems which he had been ignoring (e.g. he'd had to ignore the Turks which had led to the loss of Antioch) and focus on dealing with the Pechenegs. It is clear that he could only handle one major threat at a time – hence his agreements with Malik Shah to stop any further Turkish expansion
- the suggestion that Alexius was in a strong position by the 1090s could be questioned by internal disputes and tensions at home and the fact that he still did not have the manpower he would

need to tackle the Turks. The death of Malik Shah dangerously destabilised the region and meant that Constantinople itself could be threatened.

In arriving at a judgement as to which extract provides the more convincing interpretation, students might argue that Extract B seems to better reflect the overall situation and the scale of the problems facing Alexius, whereas Extract A downplays the threats posed by the Turks whilst Alexius was distracted elsewhere. However, any supported judgement will be rewarded.

Section B

02 'Baldwin II was a more successful king of Jerusalem than Baldwin I in the years 1100 to 1131.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: 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.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments suggesting that Baldwin II was a more successful king of Jerusalem than Baldwin I in the years 1100 to 1131 might include:

- Baldwin II managed to deal effectively with the crisis in Antioch after 1119, as well as ruling Jerusalem effectively – even though it meant personally taking control of Antioch until 1126. Baldwin I, by comparison, struggled to control the ambitions and relative independence of Tancred especially
- Baldwin II encouraged strong links with the West through the development of the Military Orders (who would become vital to the success of Outremer) and the encouragement of Western settlement (including Fulk)
- Baldwin II had a much more successful and seamless succession than Baldwin I – who caused problems by his failure to provide a clear heir
- Baldwin II ensured that men loyal to himself were promoted to important positions in Outremer, e.g. making Joscelin de Courtenay ruler of Edessa. This helped to secure Jerusalem's claim to feudal superiority over the other states in Outremer.

Arguments challenging the view that Baldwin II was a more successful king of Jerusalem than Baldwin I in the years 1100 to 1131 might include:

- Baldwin I was far more successful in securing the borders of Jerusalem and capturing most of the ports. Two of Baldwin II's biggest attempts to take Muslim territory (Aleppo and Damascus) ended in failure and, in the case of Aleppo, helped Zengi come to power
- Baldwin II faced internal plotting during his time in captivity from 1123, where Baldwin I was considered secure once he had claimed the throne in 1100
- Baldwin I had far more serious issues to contend with (very limited territories and geographical isolation) – Baldwin II had an easier task to deal with as the Kingdom had secure borders and infrastructure
- Baldwin I ensured royal control over the nobility by allowing some expansion of territory for them, but retained much of the new lands as part of the royal demesne. Baldwin II did continue this policy, but relied upon the lead from his predecessor.

Students might argue that Baldwin II was the most successful as he faced the problem of a weakened Antioch, alongside the beginnings of a counter-crusade after the Field of Blood in 1119. This meant that he had to rule over vast territories and focus on how to expand the Kingdom further. However, it could also be argued that Baldwin I achieved amazing successes given the position of the Kingdom in 1100 when he took charge. He extended the territories and secured the borders, which were vital for future survival. Any supported judgement will be rewarded.

03 'By 1149 Outremer was weaker than it had been during the reign of Fulk and Melisende.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: 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.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments suggesting that by 1149 Outremer was weaker than it had been during the reign of Fulk and Melisende might include:

- in choosing to attack Damascus in 1148, the Second Crusade had alienated Jerusalem's closest potential Muslim ally. Unur and Fulk had concluded an alliance in 1140 against the mutual threat of Zengi – rebuilding this alliance was now unlikely and made it more probable that Nur al-Din would be able to exert his influence in Damascus
- Louis VII's falling out with Raymond of Poitiers had accentuated the long standing question of Antioch's relative independence – when Antioch was threatened by Nur al-Din in 1149 help did not materialise from its neighbours
- relations between Syrian Franks and western Crusaders became very strained at Damascus in 1148 and made future expeditions from the West much less likely – this was problematic as help from the West was vital for Outremer's survival
- the French blamed the Byzantines for much of the failure of the Second Crusade – this exacerbated an already fragile relationship between Outremer and her closest Christian neighbour. John had been causing problems near Antioch in 1143 and this would probably get worse after the behaviour of the crusade.

Arguments challenging the view that by 1149 Outremer was weaker than it had been during the reign of Fulk and Melisende might include:

- Outremer had become less reliant on direct reinforcements from the West in recent years – the development of the role of the Military Orders (e.g. Fulk and the Count of Tripoli giving them control of some of the major castles) points to increased self-reliance. Help from the West might not be needed as frequently in the future now that many of the more vulnerable borders had been secured
- the unity of the Muslim World by 1149 should not be overstated – the rulers of Damascus were still concerned about Nur al-Din's ambitions and there were attempts to revive the Damascene-Jerusalemite alliance by the Burids
- poor relations between Byzantium and the French (and Roger of Sicily) after the Second Crusade actually distracted Manuel from affairs in and around Antioch – it was Jerusalem who eventually came to the aid of the city in 1149 after the death of Raymond, showing lack of Byzantine care or involvement
- Fulk had not been an entirely stabilising influence in Outremer – most notably he alienated some of the Syrian Franks by placing many of his Angevin supporters in prominent roles – his death allowed for Melisende and Baldwin III to play a bigger role.

Students might conclude that, whilst there were some serious issues for Outremer by 1149, there was still a great deal of stability and the threat of a unified Muslim World was still a far off one. They might consider that the joint rule of Fulk and Melisende was actually destabilising in itself. However, any supported judgement will be rewarded.