

A-level
HISTORY
7042/1A

Component 1A The Age of the Crusades, c1071-1204

Mark scheme

June 2021

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 Examiner.

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

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2021 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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.

Section A

- 0 1** Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to the situation in Outremer in the years 1149 to 1174.

[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.

In their identification of the argument in Extract A, students may refer to the following:

- the Second Crusade had been a complete failure and it had long-term consequences into the 1150s and 1160s
- the defeat in 1148 marked a turning point and this was when Outremer became weaker and the Muslim world became stronger
- serious divisions had emerged between Western Crusaders and the Franks living in the Near East, which would continue to be very damaging
- it would have been possible to defeat Nureddin in the 1140s, but now he would become too powerful, as Raymond's advice had not been followed.

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

- at the time of the Second Crusade, Nureddin had only a loose alliance with Damascus, but the actions in 1148 pushed Unur to ask for his assistance. The upshot of this was Nureddin being able to take hold of Damascus in 1154, through a peaceful takeover. Now that he held both Aleppo and Damascus, he posed a serious strategic threat to Outremer
- the lack of trust between Westerners and Franks would continue to be a problem. There were no major crusades in this period, but there were smaller expeditions. On several occasions these came to nothing due to a lack of trust and co-operation between the different groups of Franks, eg Thierry of Flanders' expedition in 1157 and the role played by the troops of William of Nevers in Egypt in 1168
- Outremer did ask for assistance from the West at various points (eg embassy of Archbishop of Tyre in 1169–71) but little help was forthcoming – certainly there was no arrival of a crusade led by one of Europe's leading princes.
- to challenge the view, students might argue that Nureddin was not unstoppable in this period. He was defeated himself (eg 1163) and he was also struggling with internal problems with regards to his own brothers and, later, Saladin. He made several truces with the kingdom of Jerusalem and also failed to really capitalise on key periods of weakness, such as in 1149 or after the death of Baldwin III
- to challenge the view, students might argue that a lack of Western help was less important once relations with the Byzantines improved under the reigns of Baldwin III and Amalric. Nureddin was scared of the armies of the Empire and was reluctant to attack Antioch as a result. Equally, Amalric worked with the Byzantines on joint invasions of Egypt.

In their identification of the argument in Extract B, students may refer to the following:

- the Franks were not in inevitable decline after the failure of the Second Crusade
- Baldwin III was a capable and effective ruler
- the defeat at Inab caused panicked appeals to the West
- the Franks sometimes seemed in a position where they would take the ascendancy.

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

- Outremer continued to thrive despite the Second Crusade and more territories were taken, eg Ascalon. Amalric would push into Egypt suggesting that he felt strong internally
- Baldwin III showed skill in dealing with the issue of relations with Byzantium (marriage alliances), his mother and the lack of adult male rulers in both Antioch and Tripoli. He also showed military skills and was able to defeat Nureddin in 1163 quite convincingly
- Nureddin seems to have been very concerned about Amalric's ambitions in Egypt (hence sending Shirkuh there as his deputy) – a clear victory here could have turned the tables
- to challenge the view, Baldwin III's successes were all quite temporary and hid the true situation, eg he forced Outremer into an alliance of sorts with the Byzantines, who were notoriously unreliable allies – as shown when planned joint attacks on Egypt fell apart
- the Franks suffered serious defeats of their own in this period, eg at Artah in 1164 which forced Amalric to abandon his Egyptian campaign.

In their identification of the argument in Extract C, students may refer to the following:

- the most important help for Outremer now came from the military orders
- Western Christians were still enthusiastic about visiting the holy places of Jerusalem, but enthusiasm for crusading had waned significantly
- Nureddin posed a serious threat, especially after the capture of Egypt
- the military orders were effective and reliable.

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

- the military orders provided the states of Outremer with a standing army which was wealthy and highly skilled in combat. They played a key role in battles and sieges (eg the Hospitallers in Egypt)
- the military orders controlled most of the strategically important castles, eg Krak des Chevaliers as they had the money (from Western donations) to pay for castle up-keep and also provide troops for the garrisoning of the castles
- Nureddin's capture of Egypt was problematic as it provided him with wealth and also potentially meant that the Kingdom of Jerusalem, especially, was surrounded – as he also held Damascus and Aleppo. Outremer had relied quite heavily in the past upon exploiting divisions within the Islamic world
- to challenge the view, Nureddin's power and control could be disputed. It was actually Saladin who held the actual power in Egypt and it looked increasingly likely that he and Nureddin would come to blows, thus distracting them from challenging the Franks
- the military orders could be extremely unreliable as they only followed orders from the Pope and their own Grand Master. They caused problems during the siege of Ascalon and scuppered Amalric's planned alliance with the Assassins for example.

Section B

0 2 'The consequences of the Byzantine defeat at Manzikert in 1071 were the main factors behind the calling of the First Crusade by Urban II in 1095.'

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 the consequences of the Byzantine defeat at Manzikert in 1071 were the main factors behind the calling of the First Crusade by Urban II in 1095 might include:

- Alexius' appeal for help to the West emphasised the threat posed by the Turks to Byzantium which had developed in the years after Manzikert – threatening Constantinople itself
- in 1074, Pope Gregory VII had issued letters asking for Western leaders and knights to go as part of a Papal army to the East to help the Byzantine Emperor Michael VII in the aftermath of Manzikert – Urban can be seen to have been following in the footsteps of his predecessor – he used very similar rhetoric and theological arguments
- one of the consequences of Manzikert was a prolonged period of political upheaval in Constantinople. Alexius had launched his own coup as part of this to come to power and it is believed that his own political weaknesses prompted him to ask the West for help
- accounts of Urban's preaching at Clermont suggest that a large part of his message concerned the threat posed to Constantinople and the need to help fellow Christians
- whilst Jerusalem had been in Muslim hands for 400 years, the defeat at Manzikert had been fairly swiftly followed by the Turks taking over the Holy City in 1071 – thus this might have factored into Urban's call in 1095.

Arguments challenging the view that the consequences of the Byzantine defeat at Manzikert in 1071 were the main factors behind the calling of the First Crusade by Urban II in 1095 might include:

- Urban waited several months after receiving Alexius' appeal for help before delivering his call to arms at Clermont in November 1095. He also seems to have focused heavily on the need to capture Jerusalem – which does not seem to have been a Byzantine priority
- since the 1070s, the Papacy had been struggling with secular rulers in the West over authority and the rights of secular rulers to interfere in ecclesiastical affairs. Urban's call, with its links to the Peace of God movement, could be viewed as an attempt to exert Papal supremacy
- the Turks did not initially pose a direct threat to the Byzantines after Manzikert – additionally, Alexius had worked in conjunction with Malik Shah to control the Turkish spread into Anatolia
- the Pope may have been more concerned with trying to advance his own superiority over the Eastern Orthodox Church. This doctrinal division had nothing to do with Byzantium's situation after Manzikert.

Students may argue that it was a Byzantine appeal for help which sparked the Crusade, but that the Papacy was probably more concerned with its own agendas in the calling of the Crusade. The threat posed by the Turks in the aftermath of Manzikert can be much debated. Students may wish to write about internal Byzantine politics in some detail, but this should not be expected. Any relevant material will be rewarded.

0 3 How important was the rise of ideas of jihad to the Islamic response to the Crusader States in the years 1100 to 1144?

[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 rise of ideas of jihad was important to the Islamic response to the Crusader States in the years 1100 to 1144 might include:

- from 1105, Islamic intellectuals such as al-Sulami were preaching the importance of jihad and blaming a lack of unity in the Muslim world for the successes of the Franks. Appeals to the Sultan in Baghdad were often made from the perspective of the need to unify and put jihad ahead of political rivalries
- when Zengi captured Edessa in 1144 he was rewarded with key religious titles ('Pillar of the Faith') and he emphasised that he was seeking to expel just the Franks – hence why he allowed the local Armenian Christians to stay in the city
- Il Ghazi had Islamic preachers in his army before the Field of Blood, who emphasised the religious nature of the conflict with the Franks
- the Sultan sent several representatives into Syria in the first decades after the First Crusade (eg under Mawdud) – these were seeking to get the various emirs working together against a mutual religious threat
- from the 1120s onwards there seems to have been an increase in Islamic teaching establishments and also inscriptions, such as that on Balak's tomb, suggested that he was committed to jihad.

Arguments challenging the view that the rise of ideas of jihad was important to the Islamic response to the Crusader States in the years 1100 to 1144 might include:

- the Syrian emirs were reluctant to combine together to fight the Franks in the early years of this period – they preferred to ally with the Franks against their own Sultan on occasion (eg 1115)
- Il Ghazi claimed that he was waging jihad but it is notable that he failed to capitalise on his victory in 1119 for two main reasons. Firstly, he was prone to bouts of drinking (showing his lack of commitment personally to Islam) and he also then began to focus on fighting his fellow Muslims for land and power, rather than uniting with his co-religionists against the Franks. He hadn't even waited for Tughtegin in 1119
- Zengi had risen to power in the mid-1120s and it was nearly 20 years later before he struck a really critical blow against the Franks. He had skirmished with King Fulk in the 1130s, but this seems to be because he was focused on opening the route to Damascus (ruled by fellow Muslims)
- Zengi's attack on Edessa can be viewed as opportunistic – Count Joscelin was away from the city and it was already quite isolated. Arguably, a true jihadi would have completely destroyed the city – as Nureddin would do in 1146.

Students might argue that, whilst ideas of jihad were certainly growing in this period, they were not the main reason behind the Islamic responses to the Crusader States. Activities were still very localised and piecemeal, and the individual Turkish rulers involved had a multitude of motives behind their actions. Overall, however, most still spent much of the time fighting their fellow Muslims and they would often work with the Franks/form alliances with them. Any supported and balanced answer will be rewarded.

0 4 'By 1204 Outremer had failed to recover from the crisis of 1185–1187.'

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 by 1204 Outremer had failed to recover from the crisis of 1185–1187 might include:

- the city of Jerusalem was not recaptured, despite several large-scale crusades – Richard of England even marched towards the city twice, but aborted his mission, believing that he would not be able to hold it even if he could take it
- despite some military victories, the Ayyubids were not decisively defeated by the Franks. When Saladin died, he was succeeded by his brother and they continued to pose a threat to Frankish possessions in the region
- relations with the Byzantines were made even worse by the capture and sack of Constantinople by the Fourth Crusade
- the limited gains of expeditions such as the Third, Fourth and German crusades seemed to prove that Outremer was a fundamentally flawed idea – even with huge injections of manpower, territorial gains were very limited. This diluted the crusading ideal and meant that the future was very unstable.

Arguments challenging the view that by 1204 Outremer had failed to recover from the crisis of 1185–1187 might include:

- a narrow coastal strip of territories was established in the years after 1187 through the capture of places such as Acre and Jaffa (Third Crusade) and Beirut (German crusade). Cyprus was also a very useful addition to the Latin-controlled territories (after Isabella married Aimery of Cyprus, this connected the two kingdoms)
- the myth of Saladin's invincibility was broken, eg at Arsuf and Jaffa – and the fragility of his Muslim alliances were clear to see. Al-Adil would need to spend time uniting his own forces, rather than focusing solely on the Franks. Saladin's 'empire' would be riven by factionalism in the years after his death
- Christian access to Jerusalem was ensured through the 1192 Treaty of Jaffa
- the establishment of a Latin Empire in Constantinople under Baldwin of Flanders meant an unquestioningly friendly ally was now present in the East – the Byzantines had been an unreliable ally in the past
- the factional infighting amongst the Franks over the kingship of Jerusalem was sorted out following the accession of Henry of Champagne.

Students may argue that the situation by 1204 was rather mixed in terms of success and failure. Certainly, the main disaster of the loss of much of the Kingdom of Jerusalem and County of Tripoli was not rectified and the focus of the Fourth Crusade on Egypt initially indicates a realisation that the recapture of these lands would be very difficult. However, that Outremer survived and became a viable state in the years after 1187 points to a more promising picture than one of 'complete failure'. Any supported and balanced argument will be rewarded.