

# A-LEVEL History

7042/1A - Component 1A The Age of the Crusades, c1071-1204  
Mark scheme

---

June 2018

---

Version/Stage: 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](http://aqa.org.uk)

## 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, i.e. 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.

**Component 1A The Age of the Crusades, c1071–1204**

**Section A**

- 01** Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to the Islamic response to Outremer in the years 1099 to 1144. **[30 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:** Shows a very good understanding of the interpretations put forward in all three extracts and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. Evaluation of the arguments will be well-supported and convincing. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25-30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of the interpretations given in all three extracts and combines this with knowledge of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. The evaluation of the arguments will be mostly well-supported, and convincing, but may have minor limitations of depth and breadth. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19-24**
- L3:** Provides some supported comment on the interpretations given in all three extracts and comments on the strength of these arguments in relation to their historical context. There is some analysis and evaluation but there may be an imbalance in the degree and depth of comments offered on the strength of the arguments. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13-18**
- L2:** Provides some accurate comment on the interpretations given in at least two of the extracts, with reference to the historical context. The answer may contain some analysis, but there is little, if any, evaluation. Some of the comments on the strength of the arguments may contain some generalisation, inaccuracy or irrelevance. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7-12**
- L1:** **Either** shows an accurate understanding of the interpretation given in one extract only **or** addresses two/three extracts, but in a generalist way, showing limited accurate understanding of the arguments they contain, although there may be some general awareness of the historical context. Any comments on the strength of the arguments are likely to be generalist and contain some inaccuracy and/or irrelevance. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-6**
- 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.**

Students must assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate and challenge the interpretation/arguments/views.

**Extract A: In their identification of Hillenbrand’s argument, students may refer to the following:**

- Jihad grew slowly over a long period of time, but the events at the Field of Blood and the actions taken by Balak in the 1120s marks a turning point in reaction to Outremer and the Franks
- Edessa’s fall in 1144 was not the turning point
- the anti-Muslim behaviour of the Franks helped to create a genuine anti-Christian feeling amongst Muslims
- there was a clear association between fighting the Franks and jihad by the 1120s.

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

- the Battle of the Field of Blood does seem to have invigorated the previously disparate Muslim world as it now seemed that the previously unstoppable Franks could indeed be defeated. There was certainly a rise in inscriptions mentioning jihad after this battle and the reaction in Outremer perhaps suggests that they realised that the situation was changing
- the massacres perpetrated on certain occasions by the Franks (e.g. Jerusalem itself and during the capture of some of the ports) led to a flood of refugees to Damascus and the Sultan himself in Baghdad. This led to increased preaching from learned men about the importance of waging a jihad against their religious enemies
- one of the reasons for Zengi’s success was that he could build on anti-Christian sentiment as early as 1128 when he was invited to take control of Aleppo by the citizens there who feared another Frankish attack
- however, it is possible to overestimate the importance of the Battle of the Field of Blood – despite a decisive victory Il-Ghazi did little to capitalise on Antioch’s weaknesses and there was no decisive and coherent ‘counter-crusade’ response.

**Extract B: In their identification of Cobb’s argument, students may refer to the following:**

- that there was a lack of unity in the Muslim reaction to Outremer even by the 1140s
- the Muslims were more focused on fighting themselves rather than fighting the Franks of Outremer
- the Sultan could not prevail and control the semi-independent warlords of Syria
- even Zengi was only using jihad as a way of trying to expand his own power – often at the expense of other Muslims.

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

- the Turkish groups who controlled the main cities in Syria were certainly more interested in fighting each other than the Franks and there are numerous examples of them actually allying with the Franks against other Turkish groups (e.g. 1108)
- the Sultan rarely involved himself personally in the affairs of Syria and did not respond directly to appeals for help from Tripoli for example. After 1115 he largely left the semi-independent emirs (e.g. Tughtegin) to their own devices
- Zengi spent the bulk of his career fighting his co-religionists and the attack on Edessa in 1144 was partly opportunistic as Joscelin had left the city poorly defended. Many of Zengi's impressive titles which identified him as a true proponent of jihad were awarded retrospectively
- just because there was no coherent and united effort does not mean that there was no response to Outremer and that this response was not a serious threat. The fact that Baldwin II attempted to capture both Aleppo (1125) and Damascus (1129) suggests an awareness amongst Outremer that these cities were a serious threat. Despite the lack of unity the Muslims won a number of battles in the years after 1100.

**Extract C: In their identification of Richard's argument, students may refer to the following:**

- that despite the disunity within the Muslim world, there were a number of serious opponents to Outremer who posed a real threat
- the Battle of Harran in 1104 was a key turning point
- rulers from Mosul posed the most serious threat and most concerted response
- Zengi would complete the work done by some of his predecessors, but he relied upon their precedent.

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

- it is not surprising that the main threats came from Mosul as this was closest to the Sultan's powerbase in Baghdad. Zengi was simply the last in a line of powerful threats which had emerged at an early point
- the Battle of Harran was a real disaster for Outremer as it saw a huge loss of both life and territory and also the capture of both Baldwin II and Joscelin
- the Franks often relied upon alliances with disaffected rulers (e.g. Tughtegin in Damascus) to keep them safe from the Sultan and rulers of Mosul – however, this was only a temporary expedient and gave a false illusion of strength
- however, this idea that the rulers of Mosul was always focused purely on removing the Franks from Syria does not entirely ring true. Some rulers of Mosul made their own alliances with the Franks (e.g. 1108) and also they fought more with other Muslims than against the Franks.

**Section B**

**02** 'The First Crusade strengthened Alexius I's position as Byzantine Emperor.'

Assess the validity of this view of the reign of Alexius I.

**[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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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 supporting the view that the First Crusade strengthened Alexius I's position as Byzantine Emperor might include:**

- Nicaea, which had been such a close threat to Constantinople, had been recaptured and restored to Byzantine hands, along with other key parts of Asia Minor
- Alexius could claim to be the Emperor who had stemmed the tide of, and turned back, the Turks and this would help to secure his internal position (he had faced the possibility of a coup in the 1090s and Byzantium had history of such instability in the years before 1081 so it was not an unlikely scenario)
- some historians have argued that the position of the Byzantine Empire 1081–1095 was incredibly fragile (lack of money, inability to recruit armies, internal plots etc) and, after the First Crusade, Alexius would remain in charge until his death in 1118 – being followed by his son John. Thus it seems that stability was ensured
- one of the benefits of the success of the First Crusade was the development of trade between East and West and an increase in pilgrim traffic wanting to visit the Holy Land. This would benefit the economy of Constantinople.

**Arguments challenging the view that the First Crusade strengthened Alexius I's position as Byzantine Emperor might include:**

- in 1107 Bohemond managed to raise a sizeable force which he led in attack on Byzantine territory in the Adriatic. That there was such enthusiasm and mistrust of the Byzantines in the West is indicative that East-West relations had been further damaged by the First Crusade (mainly as a result of events at Nicaea and Antioch in 1097 and 1098)
- Byzantium failed to gain direct control of key cities like Antioch and they did not have good relations with their closest Christian neighbours in Outremer
- some historians have suggested that Alexius was in a position of strength by the 1090s and that the death of Malik Shah gave him the upper hand. If we take the view that his request for help came from a position of strength, then it would seem that Byzantium and Alexius were actually weakened by the Crusade
- Byzantine alliances with the Fatimids were damaged by the Frankish attack on Jerusalem.

Students might conclude that the Crusade strengthened Alexius' position as he could begin to establish some Byzantine control in Anatolia and the direct threat of a Seljuk attack on Constantinople was removed. However, this relies upon the judgement that Alexius was in a position of relative weakness in the 1090s and some historians have argued the opposite and so supported judgement will be rewarded.



- 03** ‘Baldwin IV’s problems as king, in the years 1174 to 1185, were mainly the result of events during the reign of his father, Amalric from 1163.’

Assess the validity of 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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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 supporting the view that Baldwin IV's problems as king, in the years 1174 to 1185, were mainly the result of events during the reign of his father, Amalric from 1163 might include:**

- Amalric spent huge sums of money on a series of eventually fruitless campaigns to Egypt, which meant that there were financial problems for Baldwin in the 1170s and 1180s, particularly in the realm of defence
- Amalric's decision to commit to Egypt as his main focus helped to cause the rise of Saladin to wealth and power which would be so problematic for Baldwin
- Amalric committed to a Byzantine alliance in 1171, perhaps at the expense of nurturing relations and contact with the West, which meant problems once the Byzantine help became less forthcoming towards the end of Manuel's reign and after his death
- Amalric's marital issues would lead to the growth of factionalism after his death, as his first wife Agnes and her court party rose to power and influence over Baldwin.

**Arguments challenging the view that Baldwin IV's problems as king, in the years 1174 to 1185, were mainly the result of events during the reign of his father, Amalric from 1163 might include:**

- the rise of Saladin was not a definite, even in 1174. He still needed to establish himself as the true successor to Nur al-Din
- Baldwin failed to convince the West to supply serious help in the critical years of his reign, and those who did arrive (e.g. the Count of Flanders) were not effectively utilised because of internal squabbling
- Baldwin can be criticised for allowing factionalism to develop as he seems to have switched sides between the barons and the court party on numerous occasions. He made some poor judgements, such as allowing his sister's marriage to Guy
- Baldwin was unlucky that Outremer's closest ally, Byzantium, suffered a heavy defeat to the Turks in 1176 and, after the death of Manuel, the Empire descended into chaos and so could not effectively help protect Outremer.

Students may conclude that, whilst Baldwin inherited some problems, the kingdom was relatively stable in 1174 and the main issue he faced was political faction and instability largely caused by his own failure to act decisively and his own debilitating illness. However, any supported judgement will be rewarded.

**04** How significant were the problems faced by Outremer in the years 1185 to 1204? **[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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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 supporting the view that the problems faced by Outremer in the years 1185 to 1204 were significant might include:**

- during the Third Crusade, Richard I refused to make a serious attempt to capture the city of Jerusalem as he felt it could not easily be retained. Without Jerusalem, it meant that Outremer was merely a collection of isolated Frankish coastal cities
- both Richard and the leaders of the Fourth Crusade recognised that meaningful expansion of the narrow strip of territory that was Outremer would only be possible by taking Egypt for its wealth and strategic position. However, attempts on Egypt by 1204 had all faltered as there was a general lack of enthusiasm amongst the rank and file for such a target
- Outremer relied upon significant Western help to maintain viability. This was not that forthcoming before Saladin's attacks in 1187/88 and also after the Third Crusade and the death of Henry VI in 1197. Partly this was down to the political situation in the West, but also because of the changing of crusading rhetoric which now allowed for expeditions much closer to home
- the closest natural ally for Outremer was Byzantium and help from here had dried up after the death of Manuel. The Attack on Constantinople would not help any future relations in the long-term and the Franks would need to focus on keeping their new empire, rather than trying to push into the former lands of Outremer.

**Arguments challenging the view that the problems faced by Outremer in the years 1185 to 1204 were significant might include:**

- after the Treaty of Jaffa (1192) the main ports of Outremer, including Acre, Tyre and Jaffa, were in Christian hands and they had a unified geographical bloc which could be reinforced from the sea
- Richard I's capture of Cyprus meant that Outremer had a useful outpost and staging point for future expeditions
- the main threat to Outremer from 1185, Saladin and a unified Muslim World, was removed with Saladin's death in 1193. His successors then began to fight amongst themselves for control, which removed the spotlight from Outremer
- the loss of the city of Jerusalem did help to increase enthusiasm again in the West for Crusading, which had been notably missing since the failure of the Second Crusade. The numbers on the Third Crusade and the Crusade of Henry VI would evidence this.

Students might conclude that Outremer faced significant threats, most notably the huge losses of land in 1187 and 1188 and the ongoing failure to recapture Jerusalem and lands in from the coast. However, a narrow coastal strip in Frankish control was viable, as was proved by the longevity of Outremer in this form. Any supported judgement will be rewarded.