

A-level
HISTORY
7042/1A

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

Mark scheme

June 2024

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.

No student should be disadvantaged on the basis of their gender identity and/or how they refer to the gender identity of others in their exam responses.

A consistent use of 'they/them' as a singular and pronouns beyond 'she/her' or 'he/him' will be credited in exam responses in line with existing mark scheme criteria.

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 © 2024 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 condition of Outremer in the years 1098 to 1118.

[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 interpretations/arguments/views.

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

- the main argument is that, despite the success in capturing Jerusalem, the situation in terms of future survival was dire – there was no real plan and very limited manpower
- capturing the coastline had been absolutely vital in ensuring the survival of the Kingdom of Jerusalem
- the failure to capture Ascalon did mean that the Kingdom was vulnerable
- the assistance of the Italians was vital, but costly in the long term.

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

- in 1098 the crusaders controlled isolated blocks of land (Edessa, Antioch and Jerusalem) but little land in between and only one port at Jaffa. Without control of the coast they would not be able to get supplies and reinforcements from the west
- the need to capture the coastline was heightened by the manpower crisis – as there had been no plan for how to rule any land captured. Godfrey and Baldwin had been left with 300 knights and there were similar numbers in the north. Capturing ports like Acre, Beirut and Sidon allowed for boatloads of pilgrims to arrive on a regular basis – these men were used to bolster the army on an ad hoc basis
- the most serious threats posed to Outremer in the first decade came from Fatimid Egypt and the three Battles of Ramla highlight the importance of Ascalon
- however, the cost of involving the Italians should not be overstated. As they were given control of parts of the ports captured, it meant that they had a vested interest in ensuring Outremer's continued success – the benefits arguably outweighed any costs
- the threat from Fatimid Egypt is overstated – after 1105 they opted for raids rather than full scale attempts at invasion and they lost ground to the Franks (eg Tripoli in 1109). When Baldwin I died he was actively campaigning into Fatimid territory, suggesting that he had the upper hand, despite the failure to take Ascalon.

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

- the main argument is that it was the leadership of Baldwin I and Tancred which was critical in ensuring the survival of Outremer
- their use of a mixture of good leadership and Islamic disunity helped Outremer to become securely established
- Baldwin and Tancred were especially noteworthy as they were both pragmatic and ruthless when they needed to be
- the safety and survival of Outremer was not just about military campaigning
- co-operation between the states was vital whenever they were seriously threatened.

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

- the Islamic world was incredibly slow to react to the establishment of Outremer and continued its infighting. This allowed the states, which had very limited manpower, to consolidate slowly and gradually add territory and connect up their states into a solid strip of land. For example, it was not until 1111 that Baghdad began to respond to requests for help in any meaningful way
- both Baldwin and Tancred showed skill in negotiating with local rulers (eg Tughtegin) – they both accepted the need to work with the local populations against the Turks. Baldwin adopted a policy of clemency towards besieged cities which surrendered, and massacred those which did not
- the Franks remained outnumbered, and mostly lived within the walled cities. The countryside, and fertile parts of Outremer, were mostly inhabited by indigenous peoples who were allowed freedom of worship. This ensured that the economy flourished
- there was quite a bit of infighting amongst the Franks which contributed to instability (eg the argument over Edessa between Tancred and Baldwin II)
- it could be argued that, despite the disunity of the Muslims, they were still capable of inflicting serious defeats (eg Harran 1104), so this factor should not be overstated.

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

- the main argument is that Outremer was incredibly unstable and vulnerable. It seemed doomed to collapse from the outset
- Christian inhabitants were in a minority and much of the lands were unoccupied
- there were serious rivalries between the individual states which left them vulnerable
- the surrounding Muslim powers posed a continual and serious threat.

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

- Outremer was a continuous, but very narrow, strip of land along the coast. Once they had captured much of the coastline it became very difficult for them to penetrate into the hinterland and attempts to take places such as Aleppo never worked
- there was often reluctance from the rulers of each state to work together. Tancred's ambitions brought him into conflict with Baldwin I and Baldwin II of Edessa and there was infighting over who would rule Tripoli
- the defeat at Harran in 1104 illustrated the scale of the problem – a single pitched battle being lost meant lands were haemorrhaged and (for Antioch in particular) the hard work of expansion had to begin again
- although the Franks were in a minority, this oversimplifies the situation. The local population of Arab Muslims, Armenian Christians, Bedouin etc often did not like their former Turkish overlords and so were willing to co-operate fully with the Franks
- very few within the Muslim world realised the ideological power behind the First Crusade/establishment of Outremer and so their attacks tended to be piecemeal, which was easy for the Franks to deal with. Tughtegin's probable murder of Mawdud shows that he was more worried about his own independence from Baghdad than in expelling the Franks from the Near East.

Section B

- 0 2** 'A desire to increase their own political power was the main reason why Popes called Crusades in the years 1095 to 1146.'

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 a desire to increase their own political power was the main reason why Popes called Crusades in the years 1095 to 1146 might include:

- Pope Urban II had been engaged in a struggle with the Holy Roman Emperor in the years before the calling of the First Crusade. By getting an enormous force of Christians from all over Western Europe, this helped to promote papal superiority, especially given the presence of Adhemar in the leadership of the expedition
- Urban was arguably following in the footsteps of Pope Gregory VII – a pope extremely keen to press papal authority – Gregory had suggested an expedition to the East to deal with the Turks, but was only prevented due to domestic problems with the Holy Roman Emperor. If Urban could fulfil Gregory's plan, then he would have increased his political power
- Pope Urban had received a request for help from Alexius months before he preached his crusade at Clermont. Although his speech seems to have been filled with rhetoric about wanting to help eastern Christians, it is difficult to see that he was genuinely concerned, or he would have acted upon this in a more timely fashion. Instead, he timed his message to coincide with a tour around Europe where he was focusing on reforming the Church and dealing with corruption (eg lay investiture) and this message can be seen as part of that wider mission – enforcing papal superiority over feudal landholders
- the expected benefits of the establishment of Outremer did not materialise and a kingdom was established in Jerusalem, rather than the theocracy that Urban had wanted. This meant that reforming Popes who came after him were willing to use crusading ideology quite broadly, in an attempt to associate the Papacy with any military successes which occurred – hence there was support for Bohemond's activities against the Byzantines (would allow the Pope to present himself as more powerful than the Patriarch possibly) and Eugenius encouraged the dilution of the Second Crusade to Eastern Europe to deal with pagan tribes – spreading the message of Christianity
- Pope Eugenius III had been unable to enter Rome due to the presence of a commune and his support for the Second Crusade ensured that he had the support of key personalities such as Bernard of Clairvaux and Louis VII. His Papal Bull was keen to emphasise that only he had the power to issue a papal indulgence for participants.

Arguments challenging the view that a desire to increase their own political power was the main reason why Popes called Crusades in the years 1095 to 1146 might include:

- Pope Urban II may have been genuinely concerned about the threat posed by the Turks to both Jerusalem itself and also to the Byzantine Empire. The letter from Alexius seems to have prompted the preaching of the First Crusade at Clermont, and concern for fellow Christians is a big part of the records of the speech that he made
- Pope Urban had very little say in what activities the crusade was to undertake – and when they arrived in Constantinople it was clear that the princes expected Alexius to lead them. When he refused, they made their own decisions. Although Adhemar, as legate, helped to keep focus, he did not suggest that territory captured (eg Antioch) be ruled for the Pope
- Pope Eugenius III was quite ineffectual in terms of the calling of the Second Crusade. Although he issued the Papal Bull, it was only the charismatic preaching of Bernard of Clairvaux which helped to get the Crusade off the ground. If Eugenius was only interested in extending his own power, then his attempts were not very well executed
- there were numerous 'unofficial' crusades in the years between the First and the Second Crusade. Popes were often lukewarm in their support for these, or it was retrospective, suggesting that they did not view such activities as particularly helpful for pressing their political position back in Europe.

Good answers are likely to be aware that the Papacy probably had a mixture of motives when they decided to call for Crusades. However, they might argue that some Popes (Urban) were more politically motivated than others. Students could consider 'political power' in just Europe, or they might like to include consideration of the Pope's power over the Byzantine Patriarch as well. Either approach should be rewarded as long as they attempt to consider motivation rather than just narrating what happened.

0 3 'Relations between Byzantium and Latin Christians were very strong in the years 1143 to 1180.'

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 relations between Byzantium and Latin Christians were very strong in the years 1143 to 1180 might include:

- following the Second Crusade, Conrad and Manuel became close friends and marriage alliances were agreed between the Holy Roman Empire and the Byzantines
- after the capture of Joscelin II of Edessa, his wife sold the remaining Edessan lands to the Byzantines. This was actually helpful for the Kingdom of Jerusalem as it meant that they could focus attention elsewhere and there was at least a Christian entity in charge of an area on their borders/providing a buffer between them and Nureddin (who was scared of the might of the Byzantines)
- Manuel visited Antioch in 1159 and Reynald of Chatillon accepted his overlordship. Relations between Manuel and King Baldwin III were very good. Marriage alliances between Constantinople, Jerusalem and Antioch over the next few years helped to cement friendship
- in 1171, Amalric visited Constantinople in person and possibly swore fealty to Manuel.
- there was military cooperation between the Franks and the Byzantines- for example there were Byzantine reinforcements at the Battle of al-Buqaia (1163) and the Byzantines assisted in Amalric's attempts to capture Egypt

Arguments challenging the view that relations between Byzantium and Latin Christians were very strong in the years 1143 to 1180 might include:

- there were tensions as a result of the failure of the Second Crusade – the Byzantines were blamed for misdirecting the troops and for not offering enough assistance. When the French returned from Outremer, they formed an alliance with Byzantium's enemy – Roger of Sicily – and Bernard of Clairvaux even preached a Crusade against them
- the relationship between Byzantium and Antioch remained strained as, at the time of Emperor John's death in 1143, he had been preparing to besiege Antioch after Prince Raymond's failure to keep his part of the deal that they had made
- relations in Antioch worsened following Constance's marriage to Reynald of Chatillon, especially following his provocative attack on Cyprus
- in 1177, a joint venture to attack Egypt between crusaders led by the Count of Flanders, some troops from Outremer and Emperor Manuel collapsed, largely due to lack of trust on both sides.

Students can argue persuasively for either side of this argument and should use examples from across the time period to illustrate their answers. Stronger answers will appreciate that the situation was nuanced and that there was a degree of change over time and also that particular personalities formed friendships even when there were tensions more generally. Any supported argument will be rewarded.

0 4 To what extent did Western interventions strengthen the position of Outremer in the years 1177 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 Western interventions strengthened the position of Outremer in the years 1177 to 1204 might include:

- throughout its history, Outremer was reliant upon regular reinforcements from the West, which they would use to bolster their armies. Some key individuals did provide assistance such as Philip of Flanders and the Montferrat family (William married Sibylla)
- the Third Crusade showed that Saladin was fallible and could be defeated. After his capture of Jerusalem, there were fears that he was unstoppable, even that he was a demon heralding the end of the world. Victories at Acre, Arsuf and Jaffa proved that this was not the case and helped to boost Frankish morale
- the Third Crusade managed to re-establish control of the coastline of Palestine – with the Franks being in control of Tyre, Acre and Jaffa following the 1192 Treaty of Jaffa. Richard I had also captured Cyprus which would be vital in helping to protect and resupply Outremer
- in the years 1187–1192, there were disputes over who should rule the kingdom of Jerusalem. Western interventions saw these issues settled and Henry of Champagne (1192–97) and Aimery of Lusignan (1197–1205) proved effective rulers, capable of dealing with the political divisions and problems facing Outremer
- the Fourth Crusade captured Constantinople. This meant that Outremer now had a natural Latin ally close at hand (the Byzantines had always been quite unreliable and had been actively hostile since the death of Manuel in 1180).

Arguments challenging the view that Western interventions strengthened the position of Outremer in the years 1177 to 1204 might include:

- interventions from the West tended to be quite small scale in the late 1170s and early 1180s – with participants viewing themselves more as pilgrims than as armed helpers for the Crusader States. Philip of Flanders' expedition did promise a lot, but ended ignominiously after arguments over an attack on Egypt with the Byzantines
- the Third Crusade failed in its primary objective of recapturing Jerusalem. Without the iconic city, it might prove difficult to encourage Western help in the future, especially as Christian access was guaranteed by the Treaty of Jaffa – there might be no incentive
- the German Crusade of 1197 was actually damaging to Outremer – they blundered into the truce Jerusalem had with al-Adil and this led to the loss of Jaffa (although Beirut was captured)
- the Fourth Crusade did not make it further than Constantinople and so any Western help which did arrive in Outremer was piecemeal rather than the sizable force intended
- the capture of Constantinople meant that future support for Outremer would be watered down by requests for help to protect the new Latin empire instead.

Students might argue that the Western interventions after 1177 failed to do much to help the position of Outremer – certainly Jerusalem itself was never recaptured. However, any supported answer will be rewarded. Good answers will think about the issue thematically and will avoid a narrative approach.